The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1919 NUMBER 263

Contents

The Week 61

Editorials

What War with Mexico Would Cost..... 64

The Essentials of an Anglo-American Understanding 66

A Resignation in Order..... 69

General Articles

The High Seas Fleet.....H. Sidebotham 71

The Rider (Verse).....Evelyn Wells 72

Blind ..... F. H. 73

The Treaty and International Law..... Ernst Freund 74

Verse 77

Correspondence 78

Books and Things..... 81

Reviews of Books

James Ford Rhodes.....Charles A. Beard 82

Horace Reprocessed .....Alvin Johnson 83

Women's Wages .....Signe Toksvig 84

Winged Victory .....Edward Eyre Hunt 85

Special Section

Education: The National Problem..... William C. Bagley 87

The Week

IT is highly significant that the first sign of compromise and adjustment between Germany and the Allies should occur after the failure of American ratification. The dictatorship of the continent, which is the central object of the Treaty of Versailles, rested upon the American guarantee. The refusal of that guarantee is immediately effective in forcing the abandonment of claims like those in respect to the Scapa Flow sinkings and the protocol. With the withdrawal of America the dictatorship breaks down, and the first grudging steps are taken towards a revision of the spirit of the Versailles settlement. That settlement was conceived on the wholly indefensible theory that it could be enforced by America. It was never conceived as a peace in Europe by Europe for Europe. It was always an imposed, an artificial, and a dangerously unstable contraption. It was written on the assumption of permanent American entanglement in the perpetuation of an eternal feud.

THE settlement would never have been enforced except by the application of violence in which America carried the burden. It cannot possibly be enforced if America retains liberty of action. The inherent bluff and unreality of the whole business will gradually reveal themselves in the next five years or so, and with the passing of the politicians who bungled at Paris, there will arise the necessity for a revision of the settlement on terms which permit the restoration of normal life on the continent. The logic of the facts will dominate passion and propaganda, and when the world conference reassembles to undo the blunders of Versailles the statesmen will proceed on an estimate of the real forces in Europe and not on the fantastic theory of a dictatorship à la Louis Quatorze.

SENATOR Fall brings a serious charge against the Mexican Embassy in Washington. He asserts that this agency is "deliberately stirring revolutionary troubles" in the United States and engaging in "Bolshevist propaganda." This point, he thinks, "will doubtless be denied by those who are attempting to uphold Carranza." But his evidence he believes to be incontrovertible. That evidence is being issued in serial form, and only the first instalment is at hand as this paper goes to press. Its chief exhibit is a booklet called The Conspiracy Against Mexico, which Senator Fall declares Ambassador Bonillas helped distribute.

THIS pamphlet does not establish even a prima facie case against Carranza as the would-be plotter of American revolution and dismemberment. Referring to Mexico's new constitution the pamphlet declares that "outside of Soviet Russia no country in the world has taken such a step toward real liberty." But a comparison of this sort can scarcely be called Bolshevist propaganda, particularly if conditions in Mexico are as bad as Senator Fall says they are. The bulk of the pamphlet, as it is described in the newspapers, apparently consists of such allegations as that President Wilson

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

changes his mind, that "Wall Street" wants intervention, and that part of the American press is pro-annexation. With the pamphlet's conclusion many who are not Bolshevists might agree: "Let it be the business of American labor, of all lovers of freedom and fair play, to keep hands off Mexico."

SENATOR Fall's evidence, however, does confirm what was already known, namely that President Carranza distrusts the United States. Thus his letter to the lady who was writing a book on the "Carranza Doctrine" refers to the "tortuosity of American policy." . If the Mexican President is wise, he will leave such judgments to the verdict of history, and will at this moment consult the interests of Mexico and not his own prejudices. He will listen particularly to the advice of those Americans who are resisting intervention when they tell him to hurry and put his house in order. The plain fact is that the next administration will be Republican; in all probability that means intervention unless Mexico in the meantime removes the main cause of the interventionist campaign and the basis of its propaganda. Specifically, Mexico should settle the oil controversy by enacting the law proposed by President Carranza himself; it should not permit Jenkins cases involving prestige and national punctilio to arise, and President Carranza might well come down off his high horse, and offer some concrete plan of friendly cooperation for the settlement of claims and differences.

THROUGHOUT the course of the Jenkins case Senators and editors have insisted that our real grievance against Mexico was not based upon this one affair but upon the fact that a long list of American citizens had been killed in Mexico—and that their slayers have gone unpunished. A recent report published by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People draws a shocking comparison. Nine Americans have been killed in Mexico since July 31st; thirty-six Americans have been killed by mobs in the United States, since the same date. Our own record is no apology for anyone else. It does not bring back lives lost in Mexico. But there are public men who cry war with Mexico for a crime whose commission they will pardon by silence, when it is done on our own side of the Rio Grande.

"TO save time, money and vain hope it may as well be recognized now that there is nothing to be done with the White Russian armies as at present constituted." That is the frank message which one of the correspondents of the New York Times, Mr. Walter Duranty, sends to his editor. There is jealousy and intrigue among the officers who follow Yudenitch: they seem to have "every object save that of getting the best results for the whole army." There are stories of the actual sale to the Bolsheviki, by Denikin's subordinates, of war material supplied by the British. And there are reports, from Kolchak's army, of "an exceedingly low state both of morale and discipline."

MR. DURANTY goes on to point out more fundamental weaknesses in the position of Kolchak, Denikin and Yudenitch. All three, he says, "refuse to recognize the independence of the small nations formerly attached to the Russian Empire, thus alienating all their desire to cooperate." Moreover, "their severity toward the population of the country they occupy is such as to cause incessant revolts in their rear." And finally, "what guarantee is there that these Tsarist reactionaries, for they have shown themselves to be nothing else in conduct, despite vague professions of liberality, will stand for a moment after Allied bayonets are withdrawn against the people of Russia who have tasted freedom?" Mr. Duranty pleads for Allied command of the anti-Soviet armies. But in the columns of the Times he has made one of the best cases that has yet been drawn against intervention.

CENSORSHIP applied somewhere on the line of communications makes it difficult to tell what is happening in the conference at Dorpat between the governments of Esthonia and of Soviet Russia. The Esthonian delegates are reported as agreeing to accept no conditions of which the Allied powers disapprove; but apparently they have gone so far as exchanging terms with the Russian delegation. Meantime representatives from Letvia, Finland and Poland sit on the fence, watching to see what will happen. Of the politics that preceded these negotiations at Dorpat no reports reached the American press. Apparently, however, the socialist groups in the Baltic states are exerting an increasing power. The German press reports a recent meeting of socialist delegations from Esthonia, Finland, Lithuania and Letvia at which an ultimatum was presented to the several governments on the subject of a peace.

THE Allies have announced that they are ready to recognize the new Hungarian cabinet as a provisional government with which the Supreme Council can negotiate until elections are held—provided the elections are free and democratic.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus, for the first time in the long sequence of Karolyi, Bela Kun, Peidl, the Archduke Joseph, Friedrich, and now Huszar Hungary has a government of diplomatic standing. One guesses that it is not a very different government from the one that preceded it. In the cabinet appear Friedrich and other friends of the Hapsburg circle. These men have tolerated a White Terror in Budapest; will they now tolerate free and democratic elections?

MR. CHARLES GRASTY is one of the most optimistic correspondents on the staff of the Times, but his description of affairs in Asia Minor warrants his guess that a peaceful partition of Turkey may prove to be more difficult than the enforcement of a treaty with Germany. The most dangerous situation, he thinks, is around Smyrna and the Meander River—where the Greeks have 70,000 troops facing the Turks. Immediately to the south are the Italians, with Adalia as their port. To the east General Gouraud is organizing a French colony, and further east, in Mesopotamia, are the British. The secret treaties are being applied under the guise of temporary military occupations—and applied, Mr. Grasty thinks, to the detriment of the inhabitants and the making of fresh quarrels.

WRITING in the Philadelphia Public Ledger Mr. Taft advises the American Legion against the use of violence. His warning is a gentle one; and in the case of the Centralia riots he assumes an unprovoked attack by "bloody handed murderers" which the coroner's testimony by no means establishes as a fact. A piece of plainer speaking comes from inside the Legion itself, from the president of the Dan Tallon Post in New York. This officer declares that men are holding back from joining the Legion "because they have got the impression from the various reports of mob violence in the newspapers that the organization doesn't stand for anything but lawlessness and disorder." . . . "When we quietly countenance the mob rule that has been set up by some American Legion posts in some of the cities and towns over the country we are paving the way for the discrediting and perhaps the destruction of the Legion."

LAWLESSNESS in the Legion reached a point last week that should startle even the most complacent leaders of the organization into an appreciation of the dangerous drift they are tolerating. The Committee of 48 had planned a convention in St. Louis. If any one political element dominates in the Committee of 48 it is the Bull Moose group of 1912. This is what happened in St. Louis, according to a dispatch in the Times: "Five men, each wearing the button of the American Legion, called about noon at the Investigating Bureau of the Department of Justice, in the Federal Building. They said they had notified the management of the hotel and of other hotels that the Legion would prevent the holding of the meeting if the government should fail to act in the matter."—If such action is not repudiated by responsible leaders of the organization, the American Legion might as well abandon the conviction that it represents anything but the organized hoodlumism of the country.

THE NEW YORK WORLD has exposed a vicious social and industrial order by sending one of its reporters into the Guyan coal fields of West Virginia. "The only law," this reporter finds, "is the will of the Logan Coal Operators' Association" —and that law is enforced at the point of a rifle in the hands of men nominally known as deputy sheriffs but admittedly in the pay of the operators. Grievances get little attention, and union organizers are not welcome. "No one comes into the Guyan field that is not approved of by the operators," says the World's reporter. "No one stays in it that for any reason is objectionable to the operators. And in all cases the operators get the benefit of any doubt."

WHAT to do with the railways is a question upon which Congress might spend months of investigation. But the Senate, after a hasty consideration of the Cummins bill, a consideration which lasted just five days, was apparently ready for the question. And it was about to decide the matter by a viva voce vote, without even the formality of a roll-call, when Senator LaFollette suggested the absence of a quorum. A count showed less than twenty members seated. When others arrived, in response to the call for a quorum, it developed that there were many amendments still to be proposed to the bill, and a great deal to be said about it. Practically all of the legislating done by Congress is done by a minority. But most of this legislating is trivial. In the present case the bill was one of unusual importance. And it came close to being accepted without criticism—thanks to that political system which requires our legislative officials to spend most of their time away from the Capitol, occupied with administrative errands.

AT its recent annual meeting the National Consumers' League adopted as part of its ten years' working program the promotion of the movement

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for fixing women's wages through minimum wage commissions. The League points out that only fourteen states and territories have as yet taken any action looking toward this obvious and necessary reform. That the free play of competition does not uniformly give to women workers pay on which they can live decently, even when the industries can well afford it, is now so generally understood that argument on the point is superfluous. It is also superfluous to argue about the desirability of removing the exploitation of women workers from our overburdened budget of causes of unrest. What we now need is action, and the National Consumers' League has a record for persistent and jddicious promotion of good causes that justifies the hope that it will make rapid progress toward the establishment by law of a decent minimum for women workers.

What War With Mexico Would Cost

FOR the present, it appears, we shall continue at peace with Mexico. There is to be no American War of Jenkins's Bail, to be confused in future centuries with Britain's War of Jenkins's Ear. But it would be fatuous to assume that the danger of war with Mexico has been removed beyond the horizon. There are too many politicians and editors reiterating: "Since war must come, the sooner the better." A refrain of that character has often enough gained the credit of prophecy. Something like it was popular in Europe before 1914. It is true, there are few men living in Europe today who would assert now, that the war was so desirable that those were right who wasted no time in bringing it on. The fact remains that anticipation of war makes for war, especially where there can be no reason for expecting such consequences as fell upon Europe. We may war upon Mexico without the risk of national dismemberment and economic decay and social despair.

But we can not make war upon Mexico without costs; and it is time to calculate the costs while the inevitableness of war is still in the condition of a resolution in the minds of Hearst, Doheny, Fall and Co. There will be costs, and heavy ones, in spite of all that the propagandists for a short war and a merry one may imagine. A Mexican war, on such grounds as we can plead, must affect profoundly our moral position before the world; at home it must affect the relation between economic groups, at present not too harmonious. It must affect our foreign commercial development and our national finances. These effects are worth examining in detail.

How shall we stand before the world if we follow the counsel of those who are deliberately seeking to pick a quarrel with Mexico? We shall convince nobody of the sincerity of the charge that Mexico is a menace to our national safety. The allegation that Mexico has secretly conspired with our potential enemies, European or Asiatic, to invade our Southwest will be placed in the same category with Germany's allegation that Belgium was in a conspiracy with France and England to attack Germany. Indeed, the German allegation will always command greater credit. Nor will anyone not expecting to profit by war on Mexico take any stock in the allegation that Mexico is plotting to overthrow our institutions by fostering the propaganda of the I. W. W. and the Bolsheviki. Mexico does in fact grant greater freedom to radical publications than we do, and those publications come across the border when we permit them the use of our mails. If we don't like them, why do we not exclude them?

Americans do suffer regrettably frequent injuries in person and property at the hands of lawless elements in Mexico. So also do they at home, any unbiassed foreign critic would point out. With our record for lynchings we are not in a good moral position to shriek about lawlessness in Mexico. In parts of Mexico there is evidently hostility to aliens, especially Americans. But it may justly be remarked, anti-alien sentiment is nothing so unknown within our own borders that we should not be able to overlook it in other countries. American property interests have, perhaps, been impaired by certain provisions in the new constitution. But we tolerated impairment of foreign interests when we permitted California to enact anti-oriental land laws. And as against the injuries Mexico and her people have inflicted upon Americans, the world at large will set the fact that there has not been a single disorder in Mexico in the last nine years in which Americans have not given support to the anti-governmental side. Americans helped Madero against Diaz, Huerta against Madero, Carranza against Huerta, Villa and Zapata against Carranza. Even after the Columbus raid, Americans were dickering with the unspeakable Villa and supported him, Americans who are now crying out for vengeance upon Mexico for injury to Americans. If any foreign element were so perniciously active in our own politics, could even the innocent members of that element hope to escape unpopularity and occasional injury?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The simple fact is, our case for war against Mexico is so feeble and so badly compromised that outside of our own jingo circles nobody can be made to believe that we are animated by any other motive than desire for loot. If we make war, we shall be applauded by British, French, Italian and Japanese imperialists, who would be pleased to see our hands among the dirtiest. The democratic peoples, the non-aggressive countries, will look upon us as successful practitioners of German morals. And they will look back upon our lofty professions in the great war and smile.

Well, what of it? "A decent respect to the opinions of mankind" was indispensable to us in 1776, but we have since waxed great and powerful. The opinions of mankind are nevertheless something an American will encounter wherever he goes, whether in pursuit of business or to make himself more at home in the world and take part in its work. The American trader in Argentina and the American missionary in China will feel the repercussion of an attack upon Mexico. We are not leading an isolated national life as we were when we last helped ourselves to Mexican territory. More and more our fortunes are bound up with the good will of other peoples. And if we go blindly after loot, we shall pay for it in part by the hostility of all peoples, but especially of the great and growing nations south of Panama, whose future trade is worth many times the profits to be wrung out of Mexico.

In the clamor for war against Mexico the voice of labor is not heard, and for good reason. The workers do not see any intimate relation between the promotion of the interests of the American oil and mine speculators and their own welfare. They do not look cheerfully forward to the probable labor policy of American satraps in Mexico. Labor leaders may endure being excluded from Panama, but Panama is a small matter. The administration of five million Mexican peons and industrial workers is something of far graver import, and American labor does not like the accepted principles of the management of tropical possessions. Besides, the prospect of conscription or half-forced volunteering, the prospect of more espionage laws, work or fight laws, anti-strike injunctions, is not alluring to labor. There may have been times in history when a foreign war might be regarded as a sedative of domestic unrest. Nobody in his senses would regard the present time as of such a character. If we must invade Mexico, we ought to be prepared to take with a good face an increase of bitterness in the economic struggle at home.

These costs are impalpable, yet, we believe, of more significance in the long run than the direct money outlays that would be entailed in "straightening out Mexico." Those direct outlays are, however, by no means of negligible weight. If we go into Mexico, it will not be with the inexpensive bravado of a Cortez, but with forces which in magnitude and equipment will make resistance futile. We might subjugate Mexico with very little fighting if our forces were sufficiently overwhelming. It is sufficiently clear that we shall try to make our forces overwhelming, rather than throw away the lives of our men in anything like fairly matched battles.

We shall not undertake to say precisely what forces would answer the requirements. If it were merely proposed to seize the principal ports and inland cities no very great force would be required. But our only excuse for intervention is the suppression of banditry, and that would involve the dispersion throughout the country of bodies of men powerful enough to crush down all probable opposition. We know of no competent military authority who would vouch for the accomplishment of this end within less than two years and with a force of less than half a million men. That implies an initial expenditure of two billions. We should thereafter have a continuous financial drain for garrisoning, which, together with the increases in our army and navy demanded by our new position as a world menace, might be estimated modestly at half a billion a year.

Two billion added to our debt and an increased annual charge equivalent to the interest of ten billions more, those are the terms on which a prudent bidder would undertake to straighten out Mexico. Some other contractor might offer to do it for less, but we should respectfully advise close scrutiny of his items. We suspect that such a bidder would scheme to make his money out of items left vague, with opportunity for changes in the specifications.

Halve this expenditure, or quarter it, if you choose: how would it then compare with the values it is proposed to buy? The aggregate of American holdings in Mexico fall well short of an honest billion, in the near future, except by a Balkan policy of dispossessing the present owners. And ten billions: that is more than half of everything of value in all Mexico. Say that we laid our hands on all the mines and railways, all the lands except the gardens that maintain the peons, we should still not cover our expenses. What kind of proposition is this to put to a practical people, especially since the costs must come out of excises and custom duties, supertaxes and normal and sub-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

normal income tax rates, while the profits are to go to Doheny, Hearst, Fall and Co.?

Once we have counted the cost we may find it worth while to glance at the actual improvements Mexico has effected since the artificial system of Diaz crumbled. We shall observe that miracle of Latin American politics, a dictator preparing in good faith to surrender power to a regularly elected successor. We shall note that a most wretched chaos of paper money has given way to hard money rather too good for convenient use; that the public revenues are picking up rapidly; that the movement of trade compares favorably in volume with the best years of Diaz; that the peon, though still a long way even from our American Eden, is nevertheless freer and more prosperous than ever before in history. We shall also note that life and property are less secure than in the United States; that there are grafters who exceed in cupidity our best American talent; that too much public money is spent on the army and too little on education, as compared with our own standards, but not as compared with the standards of most other peoples we do not propose to invade. We shall hope that Mexico may rise as soon as possible to standards as admirable as we conceive our own to be; but we shall not see in her failure to attain those standards an adequate cause for war.

The Essentials of an Anglo-American Understanding

WE print on another page of this issue an article by Mr. Herbert Sidebotham, containing a suggestion which we recommend to the close attention of our readers. In brief, Mr. Sidebotham proposes a naval agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom which looks toward the merging of the high seas fleets of the two countries for the purpose of establishing an irresistible joint preponderance of sea power. America and Great Britain would both agree to divide their navies into two sections. The first of these sections would fly the national flag and be subject to the exclusive orders of their respective national governments. It would consist of mines, submarines and smaller craft, whose chief purpose is that of coast defense. The second section would consist of the dreadnoughts and the auxiliary vessels which are built for the purpose of keeping open during war maritime communications outside territorial waters. The vessels of this high seas fleet would fly not only the flags of their national governments but also the joint flag of the League of Nations. The fleet would be placed at the orders of the League and would be available only as its instrument. The United States and Great Britain would agree to joint resistance against an invasion of each other's territory, actual or threatened, from over seas. The object and effect of the agreement would be to put an end to the use of sea power, particularly in its control over maritime commerce during war, except for defense against invasion or in obedience to a mandate from an international authority.

That so radical and far-reaching a proposal should come from a British source is, we believe, profoundly significant. Ever since Englishmen became nationally self-conscious, they have considered a substantial preponderance of sea power as by far the most important safeguard of their safety as a nation. Yet here is a thoughtful and responsible Englishman, ranking high among the civilian authorities on military and naval questions, who proposes that Great Britain share the control of the seas with the United States and place effective exercise of that control under international authority. How far Mr. Sidebotham's proposal will receive the support of his fellow-countrymen we do not pretend to know. He pleads for it on the eminently practical ground that in this way they might save some four hundred million pounds a year; and presumably the British taxpayers will be open-minded about adopting any course consistent with national safety and self-respect which saves them four hundred million pounds a year. But the proposal will manifestly incur violent opposition in both countries from those individuals and groups whose profession it is to magnify by irritation the national egotism of their fellow citizens. Is such opposition certain to prevail? What are the advantages of Mr. Sidebotham's proposal from the American standpoint? And what serious obstacles will it have to overcome?

In our opinion its advantages for this country are manifest and overwhelming. If adopted, it would secure to the United States at a minimum cost every substantial benefit for which American statesmen have contended since the Napoleonic wars under the name of the freedom of the seas. In the controversies over the maritime sections of international law which recurred during the nineteenth century, the United States, as a nation which occupied the position of a pacific neutral trader in relation to wars between European powers, argued in favor of placing the utmost restrictions on the rights of a belligerent who controlled the sea to prevent commerce between its enemies and neutrals. The United Kingdom, on the other hand, as

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the actual mistress of the seas, naturally used her influence in favor of allowing a power which established a blockade or could exercise the right of capture at sea, the utmost latitude in the exercise of those rights. The traditional policy of the United States in favor of a liberal definition of neutral trading rights during war included a mixture of desirable and undesirable, possible and impossible objects of national policy. In the long run neither the United States nor any presumably pacific neutral could succeed in prohibiting a powerful maritime belligerent from employing to the limit the exercise of its ability to destroy trade which benefited an equally powerful enemy. The whole dubious system of checks on the right of sea power to destroy the maritime commerce of an enemy gradually faded away during the early years of the Great War, and the protest of the American government merely halted without stopping their disappearance. But the vital importance of an uninterrupted flow of maritime imports to a belligerent, which provided Great Britain with a reason for screwing down the lid on Germany, justified from an international point of view, some drastic regulation of the commerce-destroying privileges of sea power. This right to destroy the maritime commerce of an enemy during war was tantamount in the end to the right to dispose of the lives of other nations. If nations which did not possess preponderant sea power were to preserve any effective independence, they could reasonably demand definite legal guarantees against its abuse in the interest of an egotistical national policy on the part of the mistress of the seas.

As a result of American participation in the war and of the triumph of the Allies, the American people possess a greater stake than ever in the equitable settlement of the international questions involved by the disposition and regulation of sea power. They are in a position, unprecedented in their history of being both dangerous to Great Britain and of being exposed to danger from her. Now that the German merchant and naval marines are destroyed and the American merchant and naval marines are being so considerably increased, America is left as the only possible competitor of Great Britain for the control of the seas. And because of the comparatively greater volume of our maritime commerce and the huge total of our mercantile tonnage, America is vulnerable as never before to an attack by the mistress of the seas. There are only two ways in which she can secure herself against the disastrous consequences of such a possible attack. One is to build a fleet large enough in the event of war to wrest the control of the seas from the British navy. The other is to seek an understanding with Great Britain along the general lines proposed by Mr. Sidebotham. If America wants to have her future security guaranteed without embarking on the suicidal policy of competing with Great Britain for preponderance in sea power, American public opinion must seriously consider the negotiation of a definite and comprehensive naval agreement between the two countries.

It will be both wasteful and dangerous to allow the existing ambiguous relationship between the United States and Great Britain to continue. It will be wasteful, because the United States will be spending billions of dollars on the building and maintenance of a high seas fleet which does not and cannot provide her foreign commerce with effective security. A high seas fleet which cannot keep the high seas during a war against the navy of any other power is not a trustworthy safeguard of American national security. In the event of a war with Great Britain it would not protect American commerce any more effectively than the German fleet could during the recent war protect German commerce. In order to provide competent protection of American commerce against every possibility of destruction during war, we would need to build a high seas fleet larger than that of Great Britain. But if America adopted such a policy, she would aim a pistol at the heart of Great Britain and involve both countries in an absolutely ruinous expense. The late Colonel Roosevelt did not exaggerate when he asserted the impossibility of a war between the two English speaking democracies; and if war is inconceivable, preparations for war are extravagant and possibly murderous foolishness. When two nations do not want to injure one another and abhor the idea of settling their differences by war, their one sensible course is to come to a definite agreement. Some such naval convention as that proposed by Mr. Sidebotham would necessarily constitute the substance and the effective guarantee of such an agreement. It would mean for the first time in the history of the world that two great peoples would enter into an association, less for the purpose of joint protection against a common enemy, than for the purpose of pooling their power in the positive interest of international security and order.

The outcome of the war has rendered such a convention not only possible and desirable, but, if the English and American peoples are capable of acting on a sound understanding of their own interests, ultimately inevitable. Before the war German maritime expansion rendered it impossible for Great Britain to consider the limitation of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

naval armaments, and the American nation was not mentally or morally prepared to associate itself with England in resistance to Germany. But now that her defeat has rendered German maritime competition almost negligible for an indefinite period, the English speaking peoples possess a preponderance on the sea, which is beyond any possible challenge. Japan is the only competitor whose interests are essentially maritime, and under the circumstances she should not be difficult to manage. If the Japanese government refused to entertain a convention which limited its high seas fleet, the two English speaking powers could arrange always to keep a sufficient number of dreadnoughts in the Pacific to protect these placid waters from the vexation of a contest for control. The announcement of such a policy would surely induce a government like that of Japan, which is capable of estimating political and military realities, to abandon competitive naval armament and to negotiate an agreement. In that event the American and British governments could certainly negotiate similar agreements with France and Italy. They could reduce their joint high seas fleet to the modest dimensions of a police force and guarantee order on the high seas at a comparatively trivial expense. Such effective naval disarmament would bring with it and would imply, an atmosphere of general security which would make powerfully in favor of disarmament on land.

There remains, however, one obvious and formidable obstacle. Mr. Sidebotham proposes that the vessels of the joint high seas fleet of the English speaking peoples should fly not only their national flags but that of the League of Nations. An organized international authority whose mandates the fleet should render effectual is essential to the success of his plan. For unless such an authority exists and unless it is capable of reaching and carrying out decisions about which the other maritime powers are consulted, they will never consent to naval disarmament. But the American Senate has just repudiated American participation in an organized society of nations, in so far as such participation interferes with future American freedom of action in international affairs. Is it conceivable that a Senate which refused so peremptorily and so jealously to give to any but the American goverment the right even of consultation about the disposition of American military and economic resources, will allow the American high seas fleet to act under the orders of an international authority?

It is not conceivable at the present time. Even if the House of Commons were willing to place the British high seas fleet under international authority, Congress would not follow its example and probably no administration, which calls itself Democratic or Republican, would dare to submit the plan. But this antipathy to any sharing with foreign nations the right to dispose of American power, property and political influence, lively and stubborn as it is, should not be considered irremediable. It can be overcome, provided those who support the plan of placing an Anglo-American high-seas fleet under the orders of the League of Nations trace the jealousy, suspicion and obstinacy to their real sources and take the appropriate steps to disarm them. The fundamental difficulty is that American public opinion as a whole does not believe in the disinterestedness of the League of Nations, as it is constituted by the Treaty of Peace. It considers the present League as a device for securing an American guarantee to an unstable and unjust settlement of a World War; and its doubt about the work of the Peace Conference and the proposed sanction for that work are in our opinion only too well founded. Heartily as we favor an understanding with Great Britain along the lines suggested by Mr. Sidebotham, such an understanding, in so far as it depends on the creation of an international authority under whose orders the high seas fleet shall act, must wait until the nations in conference actually bring into existence an authority which is international in the sense of representing both the consent of all the great peoples and a well-defined and impartial system of international law.

That within the next five years Europe will make another attempt to organize a genuine society of nations we fully believe. The domestic necessities of the European peoples, the impossibility of the Treaty of Versailles as the foundation of European public law, will compel them to call a new conference to re-consider the many omissions, errors and faults of the recent conference. As soon as they are moving in this direction, but not until then, Americans who are in favor of placing the American with the British high seas fleet under the control of a League of Nations can plead and argue in favor of the plan with some chance of ultimate success. In the meantime, the best that Americans who favor a definite and a secure understanding with Great Britain can do by way of preparation for it is to resist tooth and nail any attempt to foment animosity between the two nations or any act on the part of our government which will threaten vital British interests. The English speaking peoples occupy as never before a critical and an equivocal relationship one to another. They must behave either as co-trustees of the world's maritime highway or as two national-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ist privateers fighting for its possession. They cannot preserve a merely neutral attitude towards each other. They are bound to become either friends or enemies. But enmity is, as we have said, inconceivable. It would furnish a damning demonstration of senseless and perhaps irremediable barbarism. Their common interest in sea power, in maritime commerce, in the orderly government of the maritime highway renders a partnership indispensable. It remains for the patriotic and alert citizens of both countries to rise to the occasion and to the need. They will have to spend many years of patient negotiation and agitation in removing the causes of friction and the pretexts for unfriendliness between the two peoples. Yet there is no clearer and more important duty for the American who does not falsify his devotion to his country by expressing it in terms of meaningless percentages, than to carry on this agitation and to prepare the way for negotiation without embarrassing reservations which would look towards a comprehensive and permanent agreement.

A Resignation in Order

WHERE governments are really responsible, when an administrative head either through stupidity or through unfortunate circumstances has failed signally in an undertaking vital to the general welfare, his resignation is expected, and usually given promptly even without the compulsion of an adverse legislative vote. When Orlando and Sonnino failed to impress their views of the Adriatic settlement upon the peace conference, they resigned. When the British government was put squarely face to face with a railway tie-up, it was well understood that unless they managed to patch up the difficulty promptly, a whole batch of resignations would be in order. We in America have not a responsible government: on the contrary, we seem to have at present the most hopelessly irresponsible governmental organization known outside of the realm of philosophic anarchy. But every one who has thought seriously about our form of government knows that we ought to attain somehow to responsibility. Every man of sufficient calibre to be entrusted with cabinet office must surely know that when he has failed in a major project behind which he has placed his personality, he ought to resign and make way for a successor who may be wiser or more lucky. We have precedents for such action, one so recent as Mr. McAdoo's retirement when Congress refused to sanction the five-year extension of railway control.

This precedent we respectfully recommend to the attention of Mr. Palmer. He undertook to dig coal by injunction. After a month of Mr. Palmer's methods, the people of a thousand cities are shivering; factories are closing down; our foreign trade is suffering from the denial of bunker coal; curtailment of railmay service is upon us. Only the intervention of the President with a plan for a temporary settlement, and a commission for investigation, has broken the deadlock Mr. Palmer created. And failure to dig coal is by no means the full measure of the consequences of Mr. Palmer's policy. He has strengthened the impression that the government is opposed to labor, and thereby has added fuel to the fires of unrest. Our labor morale was none too sound: witness the universal decline in efficiency of which the press has recently made so much. It is as much worse today than a month ago as Mr. Palmer could make it. There is just one way in which he could even in part undo the mischief he has wrought, and that is by resigning.

We are not charging Mr. Palmer with any motives that are not of the highest and most patriotic. The underground gossip runs that Mr. Palmer was shooting his bolt for the Presidency. The times, so it is murmured, demand a strong man for President. What could be a greater exhibition of strength than to supply the nation's need for coal by sheer will power and legal process? We are not especially interested in motives, and if we were, we should not set down an ambition for highest office as unworthy. What concerns us is the fact of failure that looms out of the mists of motives and expectations. The industrial machine was going badly and Mr. Palmer threw a monkey-wrench into the hopper. That is enough: the discussion of his purposes and provocation may be left to the makers of fables.

What is plain is that the machine needed, not administrative sabotage, but the most patient and most expert overhauling. The whole system of bituminous coal supply is defective, and none of the plans as yet offered by the administration will cure it. Look at the facts. According to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, the actual average earnings of miners and loaders in the bituminous mines in 1919 were $23.56 weekly. They might have earned $28.05 if every miner had been on hand every hour the mines were open; that is, if no miner had ever been ill and none had shirked. They might have earned $40.42 if every mine had been open every possible working day. Certainly nobody would maintain that the actual wages of $23.56, or even the rather improbable "possible wages" of $28.05 are adequate to an employment involving as much skill, hardship and risk as coal mining. It is to be remembered, 2,500 miners are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

killed annually, out of 750,000. That is three per thousand, or over 25 per cent added to the normal death rate for men of working age. Besides, if the wages and conditions of employment were really satisfactory, how could we account for the fact that native Americans avoid the mines and leave a gap to be filled by immigrants, mostly from the poorer and more oppressed countries? Aliens of this kind make up about one-fifth of the working personnel, a point out of which the employers propaganda makes dubious capital.

The bituminous industry is not going to be restored to health by Mr. Palmer's program of forced labor. It is not going to be restored by Dr. Garfield's fourteen per cent advance, at the expense of the operators, nor by Secretary Wilson's 31.61 per cent, presumably at the expense of everybody. Not one of these plans makes any progress whatever toward a solution of the fundamental difficulty, that the mines are open for operation only 35.5 hours weekly of a possible 51.2. That one fact accounts for a loss of $12.37 of possible wages, or 44 per cent on the wages that could be earned if the whole force worked all the time the mines are open.

Now, no fair minded American will dispute the claim of the coal miners to a living wage. Average earnings ought to be increased; they ought to be raised above the level of 1914, Dr. Garfield to the contrary notwithstanding, since the 1914 level operated to replace American miners by Jugo-slavs, Ruthenians, Russian Poles and whatever other stock considered the lot of coal miners better than East-European oppression. If the operators are as a class making exorbitant profits, as Mr. McAdoo implies, by all means let as much as practicable of the added cost come out of them. If the profits are moderate, as the operators claim, let the added cost come out of the coal consumers. The American people are not greedy sweaters, insistent upon cheapness at the cost of any laborer's standard of living. We are willing to pay for our coal what it is worth. But we are not willing to pay besides for scandalous waste. And what but waste are we to make of the 15.7 hours weekly of enforced idleness while the mines are closed? If they are inevitable we have to pay for them, of course. But they are inevitable only so far as competitive disorder in the industry is inevitable.

No plan of raising wages will reduce the amount of idle time. Mulct the operators in their profits: will any one in his senses maintain that the mines which now operate irregularly will not operate more irregularly? Raise the price of coal: will that increase the demand for coal so that the mines now irregular in operation may throw a greater output on the market? Quite the contrary. Raising wages may lift us out of our immediate embarrassment, but it can not solve the underlying problem of irregular employment, social waste and dear coal.

The coal crisis gave the government its opportunity to apply real statecraft to a fundamental industrial problem. The goverment knew for months, or should have known, that the crisis was impending. It should have been prepared with a plan by which the nation's fuel supply might be secured through the continuous operation of the mines that could most cheaply produce the requisite supply. That would have implied closing down the mines that now average two days a week or less; it would have implied a reduction in the number of laborers in the industry. There would have been private property interests to be extinguished in the first case, something difficult but not impossible, and alternative employments to be found in the latter case, although not in the volume one might suppose, since tens of thousands of alien miners are only waiting for passports and berths to return to their native land.

The government could at least have made a start toward a national handling of a national problem. Instead, it did nothing until almost too late. Then it debated and divided in its opinion until Mr. Palmer came forward with his monkey wrench. Mr. Palmer has failed. Possibly the new commission will undertake the work that should have been carried through last summer. That will stand to the credit of President Wilson, not of his aids, and least of all, of Mr. Palmer, whose policy it directly overrules. One searches in vain for any plausible reason why Mr. Palmer should not resign, and hand the problem over to a successor capable of seeing the essentials of it and prepared to work toward its solution.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1919, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST ST., NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRES.; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREAS.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY — WALTER LIPPMANN
FRANCIS HACKETT — PHILIP LITTELL
ALVIN JOHNSON — CHARLES MERZ
SIGNE TOKSVIG, Assistant Editor

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTIONS FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTIONS, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The High Seas Fleet

ENGLAND is in the middle of an economy campaign and the air is full of suggestions of how she might save one thousand pounds here and five thousand pounds somewhere else. There are very few suggestions, however, for saving one hundred million pounds at a stroke and the object of this article is to suggest one way in which that could be done. But it also needs the co-operation and goodwill of America and that is why the suggestion is being submitted to your readers. Incidentally the reduction will have most important political results in strengthening the friendship between England and America and also the authority of the League, and these, I hope, will be regarded as additional reasons for American sympathy and co-operation.

The British naval estimates for this year are one hundred and fifty million pounds; there are rumors of reductions that will bring them down to eighty or ninety million pounds. They ought to be, and the world would be a great gainer if they were not more than twenty or thirty million pounds. The normal naval budget for this country before the war was fifty million pounds and that at a time when the policy of Europe was steering straight for war. Now there is literally no hostile navy in existence and will be none so far as we can see ahead. If, therefore, we cannot effect reductions of that amount to a partial disarmament now, there would seem to be no hope for the future.

There are dangers ahead. Lord Fisher, the ex-First Sea Lord of the British Admiralty, whose colossal vanity tries in vain to darken the fire of his genius, has recently appeared in the columns of the Times as the most expletive and ruthless of economists. One moment he is exclaiming "I, Jacky Fisher, I alone made it, this great navy which won the war!" The next moment he is explaining that the navy is already obsolete; that what we want now is a combination of submarine, dreadnought, hippopotamus and tank all in one and that these new monsters are going to decide the wars of the future. He wants to scrap the navy and start making another one. Fisher's ideas of naval construction are sound. His amphibious hippopotamus will some day live and the first appearance of him will be the signal for a new naval competition more ruinous than the old competition in dreadnoughts. For, as the war has shown, the dreadnoughts were no good for anything, except fighting other dreadnoughts; against shore fortifications they were powerless, in the presence of submarines they always got nervous and they were too big and important to be used for blockades and the thousand and one miscellaneous duties of the navy. But these new monsters which can dive under water like a submarine and walk ashore like a hippopotamus, or like a new Trojan horse with an army in its belly, will furnish naval power with the stings of the old militarism. Sea and land will for the purposes of war become one element.

Present economies in ships may be an easy matter and the only obstacle to them is the entrenched interest of departmentalism, but whether they are permanent or not will depend on our policy with regard to the new types of ship which Lord Fisher and others of his school see ahead. There is one means and one means only of defeating in advance this new competition, namely, a naval agreement between England and America to which France and others might in time be expected to accede. The heads of the suggested naval agreement might be roughly these: 1. England and America agree to separate their navies into two divisions, a defensive naval service which would consist mainly of mines, submarines and small craft for coast protection and a High Seas Fleet to keep open communication outside the limit of territorial waters. 2. The first, or defensive division of the navy is to fly the national flag only and to be held at the service of the national government. 3. The High Seas Fleet is to fly the national flag, and also the flag of the League, is to be held at the disposal of the League of Nations and to be available only as its mandatory. 4. The United States and England agree to make common cause in the event of an invasion of each other's territory, actual or threatened, from overseas. In effect such an agreement would abrogate the whole use of naval power, whether for blockade or for war on commerce at sea, except for defence against invasion and in fulfilment of a mandate from the League and in execution of the general policy of the League.

The advantages of such a scheme, if it were practicable, are obvious. It would prevent any risk of future naval competition between the two countries. The contribution made by them to the High Seas Fleet would be equal and the costs would be equally shared. All naval ideas would be instantly pooled and held at their common disposal. According as the authority of the League was or was not ac-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cepted the High Seas Fleet would diminish or increase in size; and size and cost would be determined, not by international rivalries which are often senseless and are always selfish, but in accordance with the policy framed for the protection of the common good and of the general peace. If the League develops as we should hope, the size of the High Seas Fleet would be small and the naval budgets of no country would amount to more than was necessary to protect the frontiers of territorial waters. The freedom of commerce at sea and the maintenance of communications across it would be the work of the League, which would have at its disposal the whole product of inventive ingenuity. The naval agreement suggested between England and America would not, of course, be an exclusive agreement. It would be open to all the nations of the world, as they became members of the League, to join, of course on the condition that they contributed to the cost of the High Seas Fleet.

There are, of course, difficulties and objections. The abolition of blockade, except in war for which the League gave a mandate is, of course, one; but is this so serious as it looks? Germany was effectively blockaded in the late war, only because the authority of the belligerent nations was so overwhelming that they could enforce their blockade against neutrals. In any war less universal than the last, effective blockade would be impossible. For example, (to take the most unlikely supposition) if England were at war with France there could be no real blockade because France would import everything that she wanted from neutral Germany, neutral Spain and neutral Italy, whose imports could never be rationed as were those of Holland and Denmark in the late war. The only blockade which can be really effective in the future is one made with the authority of the League, which under the provisions of the Covenant, can force neutral nations to participate in it. The new agreement, therefore, would not alter the practice of the blockade as established by the Covenant. All that it could do would be to provide the League with a more efficient instrument for carrying out its policy.

A second objection is that such an agreement will leave us without the naval force to conduct hostile operations against an overseas enemy. But is that a real objection if we are in earnest in our advocacy of the League? Rather is it a recommendation, for the ideal of sea power is that it should never be used for the purpose of selfish aggression, but only for the enforcement of common ideals. With the authority of the League, the weapon of sea power whether in enforcing a blockade or conducting overseas expeditions, would be as strong as ever. Without it, such exercise of sea power loses its moral sanction. Blockade for purely punitive police purposes would of course be an entirely different matter; and for this a nation that had a small grievance against a semi-civilized offender that it wanted to punish by sea power could always, if its case were just, obtain the sanction of the League.

Another objection that may be made is that this agreement would be a naval variation of the French suggestion for a League General Staff which the Conference in Paris rejected mainly, it would appear, on account of English opposition. But there is, surely, a marked difference between the two cases. It is not proposed to set up a League General Staff for the navy, but only in the first instance that England and America should unite their High Seas Fleets and hold them at the disposal of the League and maintain them at such a size as may be necessary for the purposes of the League. In the second place, while there is no internationalized League territory on land (except presently at Geneva) the whole of the sea is already a vast international common which it is the avowed intention of the League to preserve as a common. The objections to giving the League territorial jurisdiction on the land are obvious enough. These objections, however, become powerful supporting arguments for League authority and League police over international territory at sea.

London. H. SIDEBOTHAM.

The Rider

A shifting world through pearled festoons,
A night ill-hung, awry
With rain, with vague and sodden dunes
One with a whirling sky.
My stallion tosses his foaming mane
And shudders his steaming hide;
We plunge the heart of the storm again,
The winds of the world I ride.

Against the pummeling night to lie
When the ways that are law I scorn,
With a horse and a night, when life runs high,
In the centaur storm-reborn!
The stinging boughs are dripping fiends,
The wet night shrieks with me,
Alone with my horse and a foaming night
The winds, and a demon sea.

EVELYN WELLS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Blind

HE was, in a manner of speaking, useless. He could tend the furnace and help around the house—scour the bath-tub and clean windows—but for a powerful man these were trivial chores. The trouble with him, as I soon discovered, was complete and simple. He was blind.

I was sorry for him. It was bad enough to be blind, but it was terrible to be blind and at the mercy of his sister-in-law, Mrs. Angier. Mrs. Angier ran the rooming-house. She was a grenadier of a woman, very tall and very bony, with a virile voice and no touch of femininity except false curls. She wore rusty black, with long skirts, and a tasselled shawl. Her smile was as forced as her curls. She hated her rooming-house and everyone in it. Her one desire, insane but relentless, was to save enough money out of her establishment to escape from it. To that end she plugged the gas in the bathroom, doled out the towels, scrimped on the furnace, scrooged on the attendance. And her chief sacrifice on the altar of her economy was Samuel Earp, her brother-in-law. Since he was blind and useless, he was dependent on her. When she called, he literally ran to her, crying, "Coming, coming!" He might be out on the window-sill, risking his poor neck to polish the windows that he would never see, but, "Do I hear my sister calling me? Might I—would you be so good—ah, you are very kind. Coming, Adelaide, just one moment . . . ." and he would paddle down stairs. She treated him like dirt. Sometimes one would arrive during an interview between them. The spare gimlet-eyed Mrs. Angier would somehow manage to compel Samuel to cringe in every limb. He was a burly man with a thick beard, iron-gray, and his sightless eyes were hidden behind solemn and imposing steel-rimmed spectacles. Usually, with head lifted and with his voice booming heartily, he was a cheerful honest figure. I liked Samuel Earp, though he was a most platitudinous Englishman. But when Mrs. Angier tongue-lashed him, for some stupidity like spilling a water-bucket or leaving a duster on the stairs or forgetting to empty a waste-basket, he became infantile, tearful and limp. Her lecturing always changed to a sugared greeting as one was recognized. "Good e-e-evening, isn't it a pleasant e-e-evening?" But the only value in speaking to Mrs. Angier was that it permitted Samuel somehow to shamble away to the limbo of the basement.

Of course I wanted to know how he became blind. Luckily, as Mrs. Angier had prosperous relatives in another part of Chicago, she sometimes could be counted on to be absent, and on those occasions or when she went to church, Samuel haunted my room. He was unhappy unless he was at work, and he managed to keep tinkering at something, but I really believe he liked to chatter to me: and he was more than anxious to tell me how his tragedy had befallen him.

"Oh, dear, yes," he said to me, "it happened during the strike. They hit me on the head, and left me unconscious. And I have never seen since, not one thing."

"Who hit you, Samuel?"

"Who hit me? The blackguards who were out on strike, sir. They nearly killed me with a piece of lead-pipe. Oh, dear, yes."

It seemed an unspeakable outrage to me, but in Samuel there was nothing but a kind of healthy indignation. He was not bitter. He never raised his voice above its easy reminiscent pitch.

"But what did you do to them? Why did the strikers attack you? What strike was it?"

"I did nothing at all to them. But, you see, my horse slipped and when I was helpless on the ground with my hip smashed, one of those corner-boys knocked me out. It was right up on the sidewalk. I had gone after them up on the sidewalk, and I suppose the flags were so slippery that the horse came down."

"But what were you doing on a horse?" I asked in despair.

"I was a volunteer policeman, mounted. These scoundrels were led by Debs, and we were out to see that there was law and order in Chicago."

"Oh, the Pullman strike. Were you railroading then?"

"Railroading? No, sir, I was in the wholesale dry-goods business, just started in. I was married only two years, to Adelaide's younger sister. Ah, my accident brought on more trouble than she could stand. She was very different from Adelaide, quite dainty and lively, if you follow me. We were living at that time on Cottage Grove avenue, on the south side. I was building up my importing business, and then this thing came and everything went to pot. They gave me no compensation whatsoever, to make the thing worse."

"But, Samuel, how did you come to be out against the strikers?"

"And why shouldn't I be out, I'd like to know!" Samuel straightened up from rubbing a chair, and pointed his rag at my voice. "These scoundrels had nothing against Mr. Pullman. He treated them like a prince. But they took the bit in their teeth, and once they break loose where are we? The president didn't get shut of them till he sent in the troops. But I've always contended that if we business men had taken the matter in hand our-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selves and nipped the trouble in the bud, we'd have had no such lawlessness to deal with in the end. It is always the same. The business men are the backbone of the community, but they don't recognize their responsibility! Take the sword to those bullies and blackguards, that's what I say!"

The old man lifted both fists, like a dauntless Samson, and fixed me with his sightless eyes. He was all wrong, I thought, but he had paid hellishly for living up to his convictions, and here they seemed absolutely unshaken.

"That's all right, too, Samuel," I said, feebly enough, "but how do you feel now? Nobody compensated you for being laid out in that big strike, and your business was ruined, and here you are emptying the waste-basket. How about that? I think it's fierce that you got injured, but those men in the Pullman strike weren't out to break up society. They were fighting for their rights, that's all. Don't you think so *now?*"

"*No,* sir. The solid class of the community must be depended upon to preserve law and order. I think that it was the duty of the business men of Chicago to put down ruffianism in that strike and to smite it whenever it raised its head. Smite it hip and thigh, as the saying is. Oh, no. Young men have fine notions about these things, ha, ha. You'll excuse me, won't you, but you can't allow violence and disorder to run riot and then talk of men's 'rights' as an excuse. Ah, but it was a great misfortune for me, I confess. It was the end of all my hopes. The doctors thought at first that the sight might be restored, but I have never seen a glimmer of light since. But we mustn't repine, must we? That'd never do."

"Samuel!" Mrs. Angier's sharp voice pierced the room.

"Good gracious, back so soon. You'll excuse me, I'm sure . . . Coming, Adelaide, coming!"

He groped for his bucket, with its seedy sponge all but submerged in the dirty water. The water splashed a little as he hurriedly made for the door.

"Oh, dear," he muttered, "Adelaide won't like that!" F. H.

The Treaty and International Law

TREATIES of peace are written to register the results of war, not to advance international law; still, they afford an opportunity for strengthening or weakening established principles. In the last one hundred years there has grown up a tolerably constant practice of equitable disposition of minor standing points of settlement: prisoners, amnesty, treaty relations, private rights, civil status, future trade and commerce, and so forth. This practice has been an expression of a sense of equity, and an approximation to law. French writers commenting on the peace of 1871 recognize that it presented "nothing contrary to the diplomatic usages which constitute the real public law of Europe" (Sorel, II 366), and speak of concessions made "for the honor of principle." (May, 268). Indeed, equality and reciprocity dominate the secondary arrangements of the peace of 1871. The stipulations concerning repatriation of prisoners, and the provisions on behalf of nationals formerly residing in the enemy country, are the same for both sides; the revival of former treaties is mutual; the most favored nation clause is made to operate against Germany as well as against France; the rights of navigation on the Moselle are equal and reciprocal; the French prize decrees are confirmed; France gets an allowance on her indemnity for her railroads in Alsace-Lorraine (a similar payment now being refused "in view of the terms on which Alsace-Lorraine was ceded to Germany in 1871"); Germany assumes civil and military pensions payable by France to Alsace-Lorrainers at the outbreak of the war. * The annexation of Alsace-Lorraine itself, on the other hand, was an act of violence, made plausible to the German people as a revindication of a seventeenth century robbery; and while no firmly established rule required a plebiscite in connection with it, such a plebiscite would have been in accordance with then recent French precedents. It would of course have defeated the German purpose. In the present treaty the annexation is spoken of and treated as a wrong.

How does the present treaty conform to traditional practice? This question should give concern even to those who uphold as justified by Germany's wrongs the "terrible severity" (to use Mr. Lloyd George's words) of the peace terms. Harshness is one thing, inequity another. We are prepared for harshness (waiving the question of previous pledges) in the matter of reparation or indemnity, cession of territory, surrender of political or military power; we look for equity in the treatment

* By act of May 31, 1901, Germany made provision for payment of pensions to Alsace-Lorrainers who in 1870-71 had fought on the side of France.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of private rights, the liquidation of war measures, and the ordering of future peaceful relations. No unbiased student of the Treaty can deny that in these points it compares unfavorably with any of its predecessors. Reciprocity is the rare exception; even in such a purely humanitarian matter as information concerning prisoners only Germany is made to assume an obligation (222), and only an Allied commission is recognized in the identification and care of graves (225).

It is particularly in Part X, entitled Economic Clauses, that one is struck by the studious disregard of any equities that Germany might have pleaded in her behalf. Whether it be war measures or acts in the regular course of government, such as judgments—what the Allies and their associates have done is sanctioned and confirmed, what the Germans have done is repudiated or left open for repudiation. The Allies determine whether contracts pending at the outbreak of the war are to be fulfilled or not; the arrangement adopted for the settlement of debts is at the option of each Allied government concerned. Pre-war contracts are to be determined by mixed arbitral tribunals, except where by the law of an Allied state its local tribunals are competent—while no such reservation is made for Germany. The restoration of former treaties is entirely at the option of each Allied government. In about a dozen different cases it is stipulated that future treaties or arrangements to be made by the Allies are accepted in advance by Germany without any knowledge of their contents. In plebiscite or frontier determinations Germany is either not represented at all or is left in a minority; she is also provisionally barred from any place on the Danube Commission. In the reestablishment of commercial relations everything is one sided to the disadvantage of Germany; not even China has ever been subjected to an equally exploiting and humiliating treatment. Even where no substantial gain is to be expected (as e. g. in the discriminative recognition of certificates or subjection to inspection, 272, 273), the assumption is that German action will be tainted with suspicion. Italy, Rumania, Serbia, not to speak of certain Central and South American states, will enjoy a credit for their governmental acts which is denied to Germany, whose legislation and administration have been regarded by competent students as models of scrupulous and reliable accuracy. The climax is fittingly capped by a blanket clause whereby Germany waives any pecuniary claim based on events preceding the Treaty, not only as against enemy states, but against those which without having declared war, had broken off diplomatic relations.

It would be impossible to understand these terms without bearing constantly in mind the extreme resentment felt against Germany for ruthless conduct of the war and wanton devastation; but that does not adequately explain them. The impression received is that draftsmen had general instructions to make all possible reservations in favor of the Allies while conceding nothing to the other side, that these instructions were carried out to the letter, and that after the instrument had been completed, the responsible chiefs refused a discussion of detail from an unwillingness to be drawn into a discussion of major arrangements.

Two phases of the Treaty deserve special notice. The one relates to the taking of German property abroad. The Treaty wipes out every vestige of the fruits of German commercial and industrial enterprise in the Allied and associated countries, in the former German colonies, and in the Orient. It is true that the value of the property appropriated is credited on the reparation bill; but if this act of spoliation is otherwise indefensible, can it be justified by the existence of an obligation to indemnify which Germany had undertaken to discharge? Will anyone think it strange if Germans are confirmed in the belief that commercial jealousy was one of the underlying motives of the war? It also remains to be seen whether this part of the Treaty can be carried into full effect in this country without violating constitutional provisions of our own.

From questionable profit we turn to profitless indignity. The defeated enemy is made expressly to accept the entire responsibility for the war. What is the moral value of such a confession forced from an unconvinced opponent who is incapable of resistance, even if it were the whole truth and nothing but the truth? We spurn to get such an admission from a convicted criminal. And the Kaiser is to be brought to trial; cui bono? Distinguished English jurists, among them a former Lord Chancellor, have protested against this, and America might well have joined in the protest against a proceeding which proposes to violate every principle of penal law and legislation for which she has stood since the beginning of her government.

It may seem to betray a sense of disproportion to dwell on provisions of the Treaty which will count for relatively little in the sum total of Germany's ruin and disaster. But the point is this: the struggle for power is one thing, the struggle for law another. Taking a long view it is easier to acquiesce in an exaction of the extreme price of defeat than in an impairment of traditional equity. Structures of power are impermanent, wealth that is lost may be recreated, but a record of inequity is never altogether wiped out. It has been cynically

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

said that a statesman may commit a crime, but must not commit a blunder. Against this we may well set the proposition that wrong doing is less of an evil than the setting down of wrong as right and the consequent lowering of general standards. There is a deep seated loyalty to ideals, however recreant we may be to them in practice. Nothing in the recent war set the tide of public sentiment so much against Germany as the violation of the obligation of treaties by the invasion of Belgium. Yet the attempt of certain German jurists to justify the act by pleading the law of necessity as a qualification of International Law was a more discreditable proceeding. A resentment of this kind is a legitimate human reaction, and not, it is hoped, peculiar to the professional lawyer. If ever in the history of the world, it is important now when almost every nation is facing social readjustment at home, to hold fast to those tempering principles of fairness and reciprocity by which in the course of time the race for power and advantage had come to be moderated. The makers of the Treaty of Versailles have set a bad example. International Law, flouted and discredited through the war, has received a new set-back in the peace.

Will the League of Nations undo the harm that has been done? The League is partly an achievement and partly a promise. The achievement is the setting up of a machinery for the settlement of disputes and for joint action. This machinery—composition, structure, method of procedure—is concededly defective and will have to be altered radically before there can be confidence in the carrying out of promises. The promise is to be found in the program of action. The larger part of this is negative, the prevention or postponement of wars, borrowed from the Leage to Enforce Peace. The positive program should be the elimination of the causes of war. That part is meager indeed. The principle of the mandate is the one great addition to International Law, and with all its one-sidedness and its loopholes should receive ungrudging welcome and applause. For the rest the Covenant scrupulously eliminates from its jurisdiction everything that makes for privilege and inequality among the peoples of the world and perpetuates as far as lies in its power the present international order. It merely refers to non-contentious subjects long since recognized as the field of international convention and action; labor, protection of natives, control of immoral traffic, prevention of disease, and even for these, instead of holding out joint action, contents itself with promises on the part of members of the League. True, there is also a promise of the same kind to make provision for freedom of communications and of transit and for equitable treatment for the commerce of all members of the League. But any nation may safely subscribe to so vague a pledge without committing itself to anything.

Those who look for something more specific are advised to turn from what the League promises for itself or for its members to what the Treaty imposes on Germany. There seems to be no objection to advancing international law where it involves only a sacrifice of enemy interests. Overlooking the one-sidedness, there is good sense and hope for progress in the military and economic regime imposed on Germany. History shows that servitudes of this kind, being naturally difficult of enforcement, are likely to be shaken off at the first opportunity. But the permanently important thing is that a new precedent has been set for the international limitation of sovereign powers. Applied in the past only to oriental countries, limitations of a similar kind have failed to make a great impress upon international law and practice. They become far more important when imposed upon the very heart of Europe and as a means of supporting the new political system there established. The new Slavic states merely promise to embody in a treaty with the Allied Powers such provisions as these powers may deem necessary to protect freedom of transit and equitable treatment of the commerce of other nations. Equitable treatment may mean anything or nothing; freedom of transit, unless it includes a guarantee against measures of political blockade and quarantine, is already voluntarily accorded in international practice as beneficial to all parties alike. Hence these promises mean little.

Germany, in addition to the freedom of transit, assumes definite obligations with regard to the organization of through services, non-discrimination on the basis of nationality in the regulation of commerce and shipping, equal treatment of foreign and German ports, international freedom of German inland navigation, and most favored nation treatment. But these obligations are tempered by an important concession which must not be overlooked. Article 378 * provides that they shall be subject to revision by the Council of the League after five years or such longer period as the council may determine, failing which revision an Allied or associated power will enjoy the benefit of the stipulations only on condition of reciprocity. The inequity so characteristic of the Treaty which puts everything in the discretion of the Allies appears in the vagueness of the term "revision" and in the power of indefinitely prolonging the period of non-reciprocity. On the other hand the clause reveals the defectiveness of the League machinery. Since

* Article 330 of the Austrian Treaty is substantially the same.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the action of the council must be unanimous there is slight chance for a revision (whatever that term may mean), but also a very reasonable chance of non-prolongation. After five years it may therefore be expected that the obligations will cease to operate or will operate reciprocally.

It is not at all unlikely that the new Slavic states will accept reciprocity rather than forego advantages some of which are to them of vital importance. In fact, in the American treaty the condition of reciprocity is immediately imposed upon the states formed out of former Austro-Hungarian territory. The Treaty also places the new Slavic states under obligations as to the treatment of national minorities. If economic obligations are added, we shall have the spectacle of a Central Europe organized into separate states which are subjected to an entirely novel international regime of reciprocal restrictions upon sovereignty. This is a hopeful feature of the new situation.

Of less practical, but greater potential significance, is the extension of the principle of reciprocity under article 378 to all other states which are parties to the Treaty. Here is the first step toward the recognition of the fact that the peace of the world requires universal economic concessions. In such concessions all the powers that cannot satisfy their needs within their own territorial limits have a vital interest. In this respect the interest of Italy and of Japan is much more like the interest of Germany, than like that of the United States or of Great Britain. Relatively small territorial extension held by the precarious tenure of power counts for little as compared with permanently secured access to raw materials and the routes of trade. And how is permanent security to be had except by the transformation of mutual cooperation and dependence into rights and obligations forming part of international law? The salvation of the less favored states lies in equality of opportunity not by favor but by right. What is needed is not merely a League of Peace which proposes o treat symptoms and declares causes to be beyond s power, but an Economic League neutralizing e unequality of natural resources. Concededly e League of Nations is a draft on the distant ure. But if we are bidden to take comfort in remote prospects why should we not insist upon at least an authoritative delineation of what is to be accomplished in the future? So far as the Treaty contains the germs of economic reciprocity, however limited in scope, it indicates at least a development in the right direction. If that development can be carried on, we may hope to get something that can compete with Imperialism—the substance, and not merely the machinery, of a new international order.

ERNST FREUND.

Verse

An Evangelist's Wife

"Why am I not myself these many days,
You ask? And have you nothing more to ask?
I do you wrong? I do not hear your praise
To God for giving you me to share your task?

"Jealous—of Her? Because her cheeks are pink,
And she has eyes? No, not if she had seven.
If you should only steal an hour to think,
Sometime, there might be less to be forgiven.

"No, you are never cruel. If once or twice
I found you so, I could applaud and sing.
Jealous of—What? You are not very wise.
Does not the good Book tell you anything?

"In David's time poor Michal had to go.
Jealous of God? Well, if you like it so."

EDWIN ARLINGTON ROBINSON.

Incompatibility

Feet that would dance on the slipping earth
Over a chasm's brim,
(Laughter in tears and malice in mirth—
Wine quaffed at the coffin's rim—)

And the pride that walks unbound:
How should these not strike offence
To the guarded soul that hordes its pence
Till they make an English pound?

A timorous heart—with a proud tongue
And a high, mailed hand—
How should it understand
The bold heart and the wheedling tongue?

Bull's-hide white under red wrath
And a curt tone of blue,
By a gold harp on a green cloth—
How should they blend, these two?

LOLA RIDGE.

The Russian Novelists

Great Pity walked beside them like a bride
And Love had bound them with an iron chain
They saw their Mother weeping in the rain
Her agelong sorrows and her endless pain
And with each sob their own hearts moaned and cried
So wept they with the psalmist sick at heart
"Oh Lord thy waters have gone over us"
And when they saw their gray land's hopes depart
"Thy people's woes are cruel and ravenous
"Our blood is sapped, our flesh an aching shred,
"Our bones are torn, our souls sore tormented
"From bearing of the burdens of the world!
"Oh star of hope, oh flag of freedom furled,
"Reveal life's splendor to the living dead!"

MARYA ALEXANDROVIA ZATURENSKY.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

The Seattle Union Record

SIR: The only daily paper which can make any claim to truthfulness in the matter of the conflict between capital and labor, or to fairness in estimating the achievements of the Soviet Republic in Russia, or to constructive imagination in the conduct of world affairs, is the Seattle Union Record. Owned by the Central Labor Council of the City of Seattle, it has come in only one year of daily publication to be the second in circulation and the first in liberal progressiveness among the papers of the district and, —in the last matter,—of the Pacific Coast. It has drawn to itself a group of writers and reporters whose criteria in respect to news are truth and social effectiveness, whose consciences are not carried in the pockets of the circulation or advertising manager. There has come to the fore no social cause with which the Record has not definitely measured itself, no despised and rejected minority which has not found in it a sturdy defender of the American tradition of tolerance and fair play. The record has condemned violence, no matter what its source; it has urged non-resistance upon the workers;—"Smile and move on!" has been its watchword more than once.

In our Russian policy, the Record has urged considerations of humanity and common sense; it has been the one paper in the northwest to give space to the words of such men as Raymond Robins and Arthur Ransome. It has urged tolerance instead of persecution, abroad and at home, justice instead of revenge, and the clear and open mind in all things, Because of these things, the Record has become a great educational influence among the workers, aligned with the university, with the trade-union college, with the cooperative movement; it has lifted the gaze of the workers from their own tasks to the horizons of the world; it has urged them to study and to understand, to desire for themselves more and more of the durable satisfactions of life, and to work together for them. For all of us it has become a sign of the things that may be, a source of faith in the constructive vision of man.

And now the plant of the Seattle Union Record is closed. Publication from its presses has been forbidden; use of the mails has been denied; the editor has been arrested. These things have been done under the seal of the government of the United States.

The reason given is that the Record "condoned the Centralia outrage,"— in which outrage four members of the American Legion lost thir lives. Editor E. B. Ault is accused of sedition under the Espionage act.

On November 12, the day after the shooting at Centralia, the Record came out with a featured editorial; "Don't Shoot in the Dark!" "Violence begets violence," it said,— "anarchy calls forth anarchy. That is the answer to the Centralia outrage.—The rioting which culminated in the deaths of three of our returned service men—was the result of a long series of illegal acts by these men themselves,— acts which no paper in the state was American enough to criticize except the Union Record. . . . The Union Record is for the strict observance of the laws of this country,— *both by the rich and by the poor;* . . . . it has never advocated or countenanced physical violence for the redress of grievances. On the contrary, the Union Record has, during its entire lifetime, pointed out the legal, orderly American way of bringing order out of our present chaotic industrial system, and has set human life above any and every other consideration.

"Organized labor has had no connection with, nor has it any sympathy for, the perpetrators of the violence at Centralia,—*no matter who they may be,*—and from the facts at hand both sides have earned the severest condemnation of law abiding people."

Is this "condoning an outrage"? Is it treason?

On the following day the Record published a resolution adopted by the Seattle Central Labor Council without a dissenting vote. This "squarely denounces any resort to violence for the adjustment of industrial differences or the preservation of constitutional rights so long as legal and orderly methods remain for these purposes. — We recognize evils in our present system and we move to secure their eradication by action within the law." The resolution points out that the I. W. W. were not the only individuals at Centralia who resorted to violence, and quotes the Seattle newspapers themselves as proof of this. It concludes:

"In view of these facts and the further fact that every effort is being made by the kept press of this city,—the Times, the Star, and the Post-Intelligencer—to mislead and inflame the public mind, and use the incident to arouse mob spirit everywhere, we call upon all true Americans to combat the suggested violations of the law and see to it that every principle of our Constitution be upheld and kept inviolate."

Is this "openly advocating the I. W. W. cause",—or "intimating that action similar to that at Centralia might be taken in Seattle",—to quote the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of November 13? Is the printing of such a document sufficient cause for closing a plant and outlawing a paper?

Everyone knows why the Record is receiving such treatment. In the editorial referred above, Editor Ault makes it clear;—"It is because the Record has insisted on the observance of the law by the rich that it is now being assailed." The Seattle Chamber of Commerce, the Employers' Associations, and allied bodies are out with the avowed purpose of "smashing union labor". Long since they swore to "put the Union Record out of business". These phrases are passwords to the sancta of business; without them one lacks credit, trade or friends. And now comes the Centralia occurrence—as if designed for their very purposes. By its means they are arousing mob feeling, discrediting reason and common sense, and befuddling the public. They are discrediting union labor, fastening upon it the stigma of sympathy with murder,—and forcing honest working men into the camps of the despairing and the irreconcilable. They are breaking down the dikes of the sea which is to overwhelm them. They are loosing that fi by which they shall be burned.

Listen to the words of a resolution drawn by a commit of the employees of the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, on vember 19, 1919:—

"We have been patient under misrepresentation, faithful in the face of slander, long suffering under insult; we have upheld our agreements and produced your paper, even though in doing so we were braiding the rope with which you propose to hang us; day after day we have put into type, stereotyped, printed and mailed calumny after calumny, lie after lie, insult after insult.

"Little by little, as our patience seemed to be unbounded, your editorial and business policy has encroached upon and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

further and further overstepped the bounds, not only of fairness and truth, but of decency and Americanism itself. We have even meekly witnessed your unfair and reprehensible campaign of falsehood and ruin result in the suppression of the last medium of honest expression for our cause in Seattle, not only denying our brothers the means of livelihood, but denying us a far greater boon,—the American right of a free press."

There follows a reference to an advertisement in the Post-Intelligencer for November 18th, vilifying labor, which, the resolution states—"might as well have occupied the position usually taken by your editorial page." It concludes:

"Therefore be it resolved: By the whole committee of your organized employees in meeting assembled, that if your business management cannot demonstrate its capacity and sagacity, if your editorial directing heads must remain blind to the thing they are bringing us to; if together you cannot see the abyss to which you are leading us,—all of us; if you have no more love for our common country than is manifested in your efforts to plunge it into anarchy, then as loyal American citizens,—many of us ex-service men who very clearly proved our faith in America and its institutions, —we must, not because we are unionists but because we are Americans, find means to protect ourselves from the stigma of having aided and abetted your campaign of destruction."

Such is the spirit which results from a situation like that in Seattle. And the thing that concerns me in it all is this:

Are we to be goaded into a class conflict, whether we wish it or no?

Pullman, Washington. WILLIAM T. HAM.

One Hundred Per Cent?

SIR: Pirates and bandits recently broke into the socialist headquarters on Vine Street, Cincinnati, and started a riot which put the St. Louis cyclone in the shade. Wardrobes containing official documents and literature of the socialist party were knocked to pieces and their contents destroyed. The floor littered with membership cards of the machinists' union testified eloquently to the character and nature of those rioters and burglars and to their animosity against organized workmen. Type-writers, chairs and clothes-racks in the assembly hall were destroyed.

One remarkable feature of this act of violence was the intact and unmolested show-window. A show-window does not belong to the workingmen but to the insurance corporation which is protected by law and the state. The rioters t[illegible]new well that the corporation would lose no time in appre[illegible]ending the criminal who smashed a show-window, so they th[illegible]nfined themselves strictly to the destruction of workmen's property.

According to the Cincinnati Commercial Tribune, the [illegible]rauders who were members of the American Legion [illegible]n line, one hundred and fifty strong, and marched [illegible]r headquarters at the Bently Post of the Ameri[illegible]Vine Street.

[illegible]chy scored a decided hit in the presence [illegible] officers of the Cincinnati police [illegible]hine also enjoyed this act of [illegible]as one hundred per cent [illegible]ops as low as that in [illegible]ed all honor and

America Must Respond

SIR: I am much interested in seeing the advertisement page in your recent issue appealing on behalf of the starving Hungarian babies.

I have just returned from a long stay in England where I was closely connected with a Relief Committee of the Society of Friends which is endeavoring to help in the present terrible situation. There is now a group of well known people, most of them members of the Society of Friends, in Austria-Hungary, investigating conditions and administering relief.

They most earnestly beg that no time may be lost in sending help. The children of Austria-Hungary have been underfed for several years and thousands of them are now hopelessly diseased. Others may still be saved but it can only be done by immediate relief measures.

All hospital supplies, milk, soap, vaseline, linen, clothes, etc. etc. are absolutely lacking. They have fine hospitals and all the up-to-date scientific tools, but *no* supplies.

I am thankful to know that there are kind hearts in America who will not be deterred by any international barriers from rendering a service which is asked for in the name of our common humanity.

The past five years have indeed been "lean years," even in England, but the leanness has come upon us by degrees and I scarcely realized its extent until on the day after landing I sat down to lunch in a New York Club and the heaped plate of rich delicate food was placed before me. Then in one revealing flash I saw the starving babies of Europe and the storehouse of plenty on which their hope of rescue depends.

America *must* respond to their pitiful cry. I am convinced that she will respond nobly as soon as she knows of their need and it is in this conviction that I venture to add my plea to that which you are already making.

ANNA BRAITHWAITE THOMAS.

Baltimore, Maryland.

Votes in the League

SIR: The "patriotic" cry about Britain's six votes in the League and our poor one has suggested to some people a scheme of representation which may seem worthy of this brief exposition in your columns. It is based on the British Trade Union Congress's apportionment of votes to delegates according to the size of each delegate's Union. But apportionment of votes in the League according to population is obviously unreasonable, since it gives passive and subject peoples—China and India especially—an absurd preponderance. Why not therefore apportion votes according to the number of actual voters in the member-nation's latest general election? In backward countries like China and Japan, only a small minority of the population vote: their influence in the League will therefore be reduced. In the most progressive countries, woman suffrage already prevails: and their influence will thereby be properly increased. There will also be an incentive for granting self-government to subject or disfranchised peoples or races, and an incentive in ambitious nations of increasing population for more frequent elections, which will make governments more responsive to peoples. And in the matter of immediate dispute, the votes of the United States and the British Empire will be practically equalized—until woman suffrage and (let us hope) negro enfranchisement give us a distinct advantage.

SAMUEL A. ELIOT, JR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dr. Jordan and the Carnegie Foundation

SIR: Dr. D. S. Jordan, writing in your issue of November 26th to vindicate the trustees of the Carnegie Foundation against a charge of bad judgment, brings against them by implication the graver charge of bad faith. In 1906 the Foundation announced that it would grant specified retiring allowances to teachers in colleges or universities which should comply with certain conditions and be admitted to its "accepted list." It is probable, though not certain, that this announcement had not the force of a legally binding contract, but it had all the essentials of a morally binding promise. For it was manifestly made with the expectation and intention that other men and other corporations should base their actions, in certain matters of much consequence to them, upon the faith that the Foundation would do what it had declared that it would do. It is true that the original rules contained a provision that they might be amended by the trustees; but no one, I suppose, then imagined that this was intended to authorize retroactive amendments or the annulment of already inchoate rights under existing rules. In the belief, then, that the trustees of the Foundation adhered to the principles of conduct usually observed by honorable men, many college teachers adjusted their expenditures, their provisions for life insurance, and their entire plans for life, to the scheme of retiring allowances announced by the Foundation; and many institutions modified their regulations or their charters—sometimes at the sacrifice of support from other quarters—in order to meet the Association's requirements. Having done so, some seventy institutions were in fact placed upon the Foundation's accepted list.

The Foundation's promises have not, however, been fulfilled. One of the most important of them was nullified, without warning, in 1910; and in 1918 it was announced that teachers in associated institutions who should reach the age of retirement after 1923 would receive only a part of the benefits promised them, and that those who had entered the service of such institutions after November, 1915, would receive no pensions at all.

The President of the Foundation has already attempted to explain these changes on the ground of a discovery in "social philosophy" made by himself or the trustees; the discovery, namely, that free pensions are not good things for professors anyway! But he has, so far as I recall, never denied that the changes were financially inevitable; and most college teachers have preferred to adopt this more charitable explanation of the trustees' action. They felt the more constrained to do so because the trustees, before making the changes of 1918, declared that "whatever plan is finally adopted will be devised with scrupulous regard to the privileges and expectations which have been created under existing rules." Especially after this declaration, one reason, and only one, could have justified a failure to realize these "privileges and expectations" in full—the insolvency of the corporation and the inability of the trustees to obtain funds sufficient to enable it to meet its obligations.

But Dr. Jordan, a former trustee and vice-president of the Foundation, now announces in your columns that "the reasons assigned for the change in method and scope are not financial" and that "the interests on the amounts devoted to the various instit[illegible] (Mr. Carnegie's) name is apparently wholly adequate to continue them all on the basis upon which they were started." Dr. Jordan thus charges, in substance, that his former associates have deliberately, and under no financial necessity, violated a solemn and specific assurance publicly given by them, and have broken faith with the associated institutions and the teachers therein. The charge is hard to believe. But the trustees clearly owe it to themselves, and to these institutions and teachers, to publish a direct and circumstantial reply to Dr. Jordan's letter, and to state unequivocally the reasons for the Foundation's failure to perform all that it had promised.

Baltimore, Maryland. ARTHUR O. LOVEJOY.

The Garments of the Rich

SIR: It may interest some of our readers to know that the Fifth Avenue merchant tailors have their workers manufacture garments in the filthiest tenements of the city. The merchant tailor compels the journeyman tailor, commonly known as the custom tailor, to furnish his own shop, tools and part of the material that goes to make up a garment. As a result the worker's tenement becomes a shop and his wife and children become his helpers. The cheapest ready-made garments are manufactured under far more sanitary conditions than are these clothes made for millionaires.

This state of affairs continues not because Fifth Avenue merchant tailors are unable financially to operate their business on a modern basis, but because this group of employers have too long been accustomed to take advantage of the constant influx of foreign and disorganized labor. They refuse the demands of the workers for the establishment of shops, the forty-four hour week and a minimum wage of $40.00.

These demands are conceded by other branches of the needle trades. The custom tailor is the lowest paid. A man will be asked to make a garment to be tried on, and the time of waiting, the going and coming to and from his home, the carfare spent, is all at the expense of the tailor. Hence he has to work long hours and seven days a week to make up for the time lost. In many instances if there is sickness in a home the tailor is afraid to call a doctor because he might be prevented from working, and so he resorts to all kinds of quack medicines even for dangerous diseases. Often cases of scarlet fever, typhoid and infantile paralysis are found in tenements where custom tailors, employed by the most fashionable Fifth Avenue houses, live and make garments for rich people. The facts stated here may sound exaggerated, but should anyone be interested in verifying them the Journeymen Tailors' Union of New York will be at their service. ALBERT BRILLIANT.

Send It In

SIR: Willingly I determined to write yo[illegible]
by which I state my willingness for
one or more articles to the Republic.
you as yet. I want to learn from
mitted to do so? Also I w[illegible]
in English will bear my
bolic desire.

I further have
in its political
a cosmopo[illegible]

INTENDED FOR UNIVERSITY USE
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books and Things

IN 1912, I think it was, Mr. Roosevelt told the public how Mr. Taft had bitten the hand that fed him. I have forgotten Mr. Taft's rejoinder but it was a hot rejoinder and it led to some further observations from the colonel. Those were the days. Nothing but peace on earth and good will among Republicans.

About that time I happened to have lunch with a most attractive young man, one of the first American aviators. He was such a clear-cut young man, with trusting brown eyes and no guile in him. And said he to me, "But how can these things be true? I can't understand it. If anyone else said these things you'd pay no attention to them, but both of these men are fine men, they've both been president, and if these things they say *are* true, then neither of them can be such fine gentlemen. I can't make it out, honestly." And he looked at me with a profundity of pained enquiry.

What could I say? What can you say when you meet with such simple faith? It took years of primary school and Fourth of July and American history to build up this conception of the American presidents, and now the worst efforts of a president and an ex-president had only barely shaken the top-structure. What was the good of forcing this youth to unlearn everything he had learned? If I took away his faith in the divine office of president, perhaps he might begin to lose his patriotism and his willingness to lay down his life for the flag. Perhaps he might go on and lose faith in the jury system, the institution of marriage, the right of free speech, the sacred rights of property, the importance of Harvard. Faith is a precious but delicate endowment. If I unhinged this lad's faith, perhaps he would follow in the footsteps of Martin Luther, Voltaire, Anatole France, Bernard Shaw and Emma Goldman—the "Goldman Woman" as the Ochs man and the Pulitzer man and the Ogden Mills Reed man call her in their outbursts of American chivalry. I wanted no such arid and lonely career for this splendid young man. I hated to think of him wearing an ironic smile like Anatole France or losing his fresh bloom to be a subversive idealist like Eugene Debs. Much better, said I to myself, that he should hug Taft to his bosom, even if mistaken, than that he should repulse him and face life without him. So I gave the lad soothing words and earnest though insincere glances and he went his way puzzled but greatly reassured.

Now, I ask you, did I do wrong? You may say that simple faith is all very well, but a man ought to live in the real world and know his way around. Otherwise he is incapable of handling the existing situation. He is compelled to evade uncomfortable facts. Very true. Quite right. Exactly so. But is it better to be able to face facts at the cost of being a nerveless sceptic, or to be something of a simpleton and yet a wholesome man of action, a man of will and character and pep? What is the good of knowing facts, especially unflattering and unpalatable facts, if it confuses you and upsets you and undermines everything you've been brought up to believe? What's the use? Voltaire may be all right in his way, but is his way the only way? Can we all be Voltaires ?

If I stick up for good faith in the character of presidents, I know that these will be a bad come-back. I know the tricks of the sceptic. But even if my opponents use their ugliest arguments, am I therefore to give in to them? I refuse to admit that there is nothing else than to destroy a beautiful faith in the good that is everywhere.

What the sceptics do, of course, is to use the old argument of the war. They say: yes, your fine brown-eyed trustful young aviator is a typical product of patriotism. And where were the prime examples of patriotism to be found? In Germany. He happens, in your instance, to believe in the divine office of the presidents. But it is much more characteristic of him to be on his knees to the Kaiser. Yet consider how one-sided you are. When he declares himself ready to die for the Kaiser you see the joke. You see the joke when he is pouring out his reverence over the Tsar of Russia or the Tsar of Bulgaria or the King of Greece. But when it comes to an American you say, "O don't let's destroy this beautiful faith. How precious it is, how noble, how commendable. Hands off, please." And you act in the same way toward the Constitution or the Supreme Court. It's magnificent when the Germans come ahead with a perfectly good new constitution, model 1920. But we must stick to the brand of 1789, with the cow-catcher added in 1910. Hail to Our Iron Constitution! And hail to the Old Man's Home down in Washington where they hand out the uncontaminated economics that they themselves lisped at the Knees of the Fathers of Our Country. Straight from the source, these old men got their inspiration, and they are a credit to the early nineteenth century. You think we exaggerate your loyalty? You agree that the simple faith of young Germans and young Turks can be highly dangerous, but do you counsel unquestioned faith for young Americans?

That is the argument, rather ingenious in its way but hardly likely to fool the intelligent, law-abiding, God-fearing citizen. Because no good American could admit for one instant that the cases are on all fours. America, after all, is a democracy. And when a young man starts out having faith in a democracy he is in an altogether different position from Germans and Turks and Bulgarians and Soviet Russians and people like that. A democracy, whatever its faults, is founded in the interests of all the people. It is unquestionable. Therefore simple faith in it is equivalent to simple faith in a first principle; and you cannot go behind first principles.

That, in the end, is the trouble with the sceptic. He thinks it is very clever to question the things that are of the light in just the same spirit that he questions things that are of the darkness. And of course he goes wrong. He is like a surgeon who cuts away the sound flesh rather than the diseased flesh. He is, in the evergreen phrase, de-structive not con-structive.

And so I am glad that I did not seek to disillusion my fine young aviator. If I had succeeded in disillusioning him, who can tell what the consequences might have been? We know that during the war there were grim duties to be performed by our young men—towns to be bombed where it took excessive skill to kill the men-citizens without killing the women and the children. If I had sapped this boy's faith even one pulsation, perhaps he would have failed in his duty.

You cannot be too careful how you lead people to rationalize. In this world there is rationalism and plenty of it. But is there not also a super-rationalism? And must we not always inculcate super-rationalism when we *know* we possess the true faith? F. H.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

James Ford Rhodes

History of the United States 1877-1896, *by James Ford Rhodes. New York: The Macmillan Co.*

IN the world of scholarship, the appearance of a new volume on American history by James Ford Rhodes is an event of first magnitude. With singular constancy he has pursued for many years the path which he marked out for himself long ago; he has been a tireless searcher of records; he has set forth in unadorned English, grave and dignified, the story as he understands it. His labors and his spirits both conspire to make his History one of the first "monuments to learning" erected in the United States. It rightfully enjoys all of the honors and privileges that belong to learning.

The eighth volume of four hundred and sixty-one pages now before us, covering the period from Hayes to McKinley is in the same vein as its predecessors. It is a running political narrative covering presidential nominations and elections, high scandals (and some not so high), national political issues, civil service reform, tariff revision, bond sales, and the Venezuelan controversy, liberally interspersed with disorders in the world of labor, organized and casual. The text is founded on memoirs, biographies, magazine files, and kindred materials. The distribution of emphasis is characterized by the same stresses and strains that are approved in the most reputable circles of the American Historical Association. It may therefore be pronounced canonical. The strikes, labor disorders, and Molly Maguires of the late seventies fill seventy-six pages; the Homestead riot, three pages; the Southwestern Railway strike, ten pages; the Chicago anarchists, eight pages; the Pullman strike five pages. In short more than one fifth of the book is devoted to labor troubles giving one the impression that labor lives by disorder alone. Six pages are set apart for the assassination of Garfield and the trial of the assassin; three pages to the failure of Grant and Ward; three pages to the operation on President Cleveland's throat, not omitting the detail that the hypodermic was administered at 2:25 P. M. and that a portion of the soft palate was removed. The Sherman anti-trust act is dismissed in a scant paragraph (amazingly referred to in the Index as the "anti-truth act"); the interstate commerce law receives three pages, the same number as General Grant's unfortunate business adventure; the Knights of Labor are mentioned as trouble makers but their program seems unworthy of notice. The growth of the Far West, the conquest of the great plains, the admission of a new state are passed over with a glance that is scarcely more than casual. The rise of the American Federation appears to have escaped the author's attention. Martin Irons is called a "vulgar labor agitator" evidently with much relish, but the lawless doings on the other side, portrayed in Lloyd's Wealth against Commonwealth are covered with the soft mantle of silence. The income tax decision of 1895 appears to have no more historical importance than Benner's Prophecies. The growth of the judicial power under the Fourteenth Amendement, the most remarkable feature of American political evolution between 1876 and 1896 nowhere comes into the picture.

So much for perspective. Mr. Rhodes is widely celebrated among historians as just, impartial, punctilious, and fair. The text before us speaks for itself. Is it just to give nearly one hundred pages to the disorders (real and alleged) ascribed to labor and scarcely a line to labor organization, programs, constructive efforts, and unendurable labor conditions? Is it fair to cite Judge J. E. Gary on the Chicago trial of 1887 and not allow the reader to know Governor Altgeld's reasons for issuing his celebrated pardons? Are Agnes Repplier, The Nation, and President Cleveland our chief reliable authorities on the Pullman strike? If it is the historian's business to hear all sides why not admit in evidence Governor Altgeld's *Live Questions*, especially in dealing with a crisis in which he was a leading figure? Does the office of the impartial historian require that Mr. Bryan be dismissed as "specious" and Mr. Cleveland suffocated with repetitious praise: dignified and correct, a man of sterling and sturdy honesty, of rugged strength, of candor, courage, honesty, strength, high purpose, highest character, and so on through Roget's list of adjectives? Do not Mr. Cleveland's works speak for themselves and Mr. Bryan's likewise?

Mr. Rhodes is widely celebrated for research as well as for his serenity, his academic calm, his even handed justice. Careful reading of every line of the four hundred and sixty-one pages fails to reveal a single capital idea or fact that cannot be found in the books available in any Carnegie library of fair proportions. Is it possible that the last word has been said on the period which Henry Adams regarded as profoundly revolutionary? Has Lord Dunsany seen the twenty men steal out of the city?

One cannot lay down a monumental work without indulging in some reflections on the office of the historian. The past, as the sage Goethe said, is in very truth a book with seven seals and written history is but the mirror of the author's soul in which the past is revealed. None can escape this deadly law. Henry Adams, while brooding without fear and in serene contempt for vulgar opinion upon the tossing tides of American affairs, came to the conclusion that the most significant thing in all the years that lay between the Compromise of 1850 and the campaign of 1896 was the triumph of capitalism over the "agrarians", led for a time by the planting aristocracy, and then by the Bryans zealously seeking to rally to them the mechanics and small folk of the cities. Henry Adams waited till his death to reveal his inmost views. Mr. Rhodes sees in the same period a great military drama followed by the dullest play that could be imagined. Though of Henry Adams's epoch he has written a phantom history of twenty years in which wooden characters come upon the stage like marionettes, wave their arms, deliver orations on the rectitude of their intentions, are challenged, and retire (usually) to oblivion. So far as the play is concerned there is no reason why New York and Mr. Cleveland were not for free silver and Mr. Tillman for the gold standard. It has been said that Bodley's book on France is an account of that noble country seen through the windows of a semi-detached English villa. It would seem that Mr. Rhodes has seen America a part of the time through the windows of a counting house and the remainder of the time through the windows of the Centennial Club.

Perhaps Henry Adams's interpretation was but a passing phase in the long panorama of historical systems—the song of the bard praising the deeds of his sovereign, the monk's chronicle, the lore of Coke, the pamphlets of the mercantilists, the tracts of the Encyclopædists, the political and constitutional solemnities of the mid-Victorian age, the economic histories of the industrial age. Perhaps they are all but the broken lights of the great light. By some we are told that all our systems are made in our

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own image, that we must see what is behind our eyes.

Indeed it is a grave question whether the most critical mind, impelled by conscious effort of the highest tension, constantly renewing its zeal at the fountain of the mighty, can transcend the narrow bounds of was uns alle baendigt, das Gemeine—bounds that seem at times as narrow as the grave. Nevertheless this effort, limited as it must be at best, is the only thing worthy of the historian. To borrow from Matthew Arnold, it is his highest function to ascertain the master current in the age of which he writes. Yet it so happens that the master current only reveals itself in the crisis of the age that follows. A soft voice by the wayside, not the thunderous tramp of Roman legions, may set in motion the master current of the Augustan age. Hence the historian must be like the poet—a seer as well as a chronicler. He endures only in so far as he succeeds in casting through the warp of the past the weft of the future—the future which he can behold only by prophetic discernment. It is given to but a few to walk with the gods in the dusk of ages.

CHARLES A. BEARD.

Horace Reprocessed

Including Horace, by Louis Untermeyer. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe.

LET me avow, at the outset, that it will be very hard for me to appraise in a spirit of calm justice these translations and paraphrases of the Odes of Horace. Louis Untermeyer might have tried his hand at the Satires and the Epistles, which he professes to admire so much, and I should have examined his results with interest and patience. At least in the Satires, the thought and the color of life are everything, and these might be dressed up passably in an alien form and language. Of real poetic art there is so little that Horace himself admitted that his essays were only prose; that one could rearrange his words without destroying their effect. But that could not be done, he insisted, with real poetry like the hexameters of Ennius. "Take them apart, and you will find in their fragments the mangled members of the poet himself." The Odes are Horace himself, and every paraphrase or translation I have ever seen reeks of laceration. And so I feel like crying out, as Horace himself did when Davus paraphrased his moralities and made solemn earnest out of his quaint mockeries: Unde mihi lapidem? Unde sagittas? Where can I find a crushing rock, or a pointed arrow, to throw at Louis Untermeyer through the opaque medium of print?

Perhaps some of his titles would meet the need. "On with the dance." Is there anything in Horace to correspond with the mood of that? "Tears, idle tears." Thus to libel anything of Horace's! "The Female of the Species." How terrible, to attempt to classify the clear sighted, civilized Roman with the muttering barbarian, hammering out political saws in the cold truculence of British sex patriotism. "An infamous rendering."—No, that title I approve. "Lugubrious Villanelle of platitudes." What on earth?—I turn to page 125. Yes, indeed, well named, so far as Louis Untermeyer's version is concerned.

"Ah Postumus, my Postumus, the years are slipping by;
Old age with hurrying footsteps draws nearer day by day
And we leave this friendly earth and every friendlier tie."

Flat, isn't it? And to make it as much flatter as possible, Louis Untermeyer drags in "Ah Postumus," "And we will leave this friendly earth" as alternating refrains to his three line stanzas. The Ode so hideously mangled is one of the best examples extant of a rich and exquisite pattern woven from the simplest elements of thought and rhythm.. Imagine an antique prayer rug shredded and rewoven in a New Jersey rag carpet factory. "Longer, wider, softer; original material and colors preserved"; so it might be advertised. That is as near as I can come to an exact expression of the relation between the Ode of Horace and the Ode of Untermeyer.

But as Horace himself was quick to anger, yet ready to make up "irasci celerem, tamen ut placabilis essem," so it behooves one who loves Horace to try to make up with Louis Untermeyer, even if he did make

tandem desine matrem
tempestiva sequi viro

into

"Come you are a child no longer.
Make your faint desires stronger
Be a bride."

Nice touch, that, "make your faint desires stronger." Pity Horace did not have a modern psychologist's capacity for penetrating the motives that made Chloe run away! But I am getting angry again, as my eye falls upon another version of the Ode to Chloe where Louis Untermeyer gives free rein to his impulse to embellishment. What one of the gods above or below shall I invoke? I suppose I most need the help of Minerva, goddess of cool reason.

The first part of Louis Untermeyer's book is decidedly interesting. He parodies a host of modern poets, ranging from Shakespeare to Irving Berlin, at work on the rendering of the Integer Vitae theme. The first, a parody of Robert Bridges, looks very much indeed like Robert Bridges, except for the indication in the fourth stanza that the writer doesn't read Latin very well. More curiously, it looks more like Horace than anything else in the book. The parodies of J. M. Synge, Carl Sandburg, Franklin P. Adams are very like; that of Whitman is excellent, and it is impossible to conceive a more perfect parody than that of Irving Berlin. The Parodies of poets farther from Louis Untermeyer's spirit, like Shakespeare, Coleridge and Heine are not really parodies at all, but a patchwork of familiar lines and phrases. Still, they are amusing.

And if I constrain myself to be fair, I am forced to admit that among the sixty or more odes Louis Untermeyer has undertaken to translate, there are many that come near the mark,

"Shrouded with ice and snow
Soracte stands in splendor
The rivers freeze; the slender
Branches are weighted low."

That is a good beginning; it shows that Louis Untermeer is capable of reproducing something of the effect of the original. And this, too, is rather Horatian.

"What virgin, what barbarian fair,
When you have slain her lord and lover
Will be your slave? With perfumed hair,
What stripling from the court will bear
The golden cups of wine?"

So often, in fact, does Louis Untermeyer strike the right note that you wait, expecting him at last to find the tune. He doesn't ever, quite. As it seems to me, it cannot be done. It certainly will not be done by any one who sets

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out with the hypothesis as to Horace and his work that you find in Louis Untermeyer's preface.

How life might best be lived was the inquiry of profoundest interest to Horace. In pursuing it he naturally discoursed a great deal on virtue and vice, on wisdom and folly, and by an instructive aversion to priggishness and pharisaism, took especial pains to make it clear that he had his own full share of all kinds of folly and vice. The generations upon generations of prigs and pedants, through whose hands Horace was fated to pass, underscored, each one, the pecadilloes Horace admits or invents until they stand out like pillars of black basalt. You would not have expected Louis Untermeyer to be taken in by this pedantic maltradition, but he writes, "When he was not consulting doctors or reading, he was fighting under Brutus against his future patron; carrying on a multiplicity of amours; indulging in a variety of wines; suffering horribly in consequence; taking the warm baths at Baiae and the cold ones at Clusium for his invalidism; forgetting caution and eating rich and almost fatal food with the Roman elite . . . Whenever he was free from more fascinating diversions, he was a poet." Of course, if that were a true account of Horace's life, he'd be just the poet for another busy man to translate well when free from more fascinating diversions. But Horace wasn't that kind of man at all, but one who served in an army once, a little while, and unwillingly, who had occasional amours, perhaps, and facile ones, as fell to the lot of a proud man and the son of a freedman; who liked good wine, but usually had a mediocre vintage; loved the good fare and good conversation at the table of Maecenas, but made brave excuses to escape the fate of a slave to weekends. All that was incidental as it is in the lives of most men who take their work seriously. That Horace took his work seriously any one can see for himself if he will calculate the labor that must have been required to transform the dreary moral themes baldly versified in the Satires into the flawless lyrical gems of the Odes. And even the Epistles, in which Horace proclaims his love of ease and sleep, are models of painstaking composition. One should look closely to Horace's verses before taking his account of himself too seriously.

This conception of Horace as rioting adventurer and occasional poet helps Louis Untermeyer to his conclusion that "the technically artificial versions of Austin Dobson, the colloquial adaptations of Eugene and Roswell M. Field, even the most slangy and impudent burlesques of Franklin P. Adams and Bert Leston Taylor reveal more of the living Horace than the meticulous gravity of Professor Conington and the precise but prosy translations of Addison and Roscommon." One would get nearer to Horace if he assumed that neither the slang nor the pedantry could reflect Horace at all. How does one better represent a subtle twinkle in the eye: by a solemn, steady gaze or by a twisted grin? Louis Untermeyer votes for the grin, and, perhaps, he is right, so far. But he banks too much on it, with the result that he dresses up the most polished writer of an exquisitely wrought civilization as a broad humorist, rather more clownish than even our loose grained culture entirely relishes.

Still, Louis Untermeyer is not to be held to strict personal responsibility for thus distorting and cheapening the quality of Horace. He is merely following the established American convention. Horace might write frankly and seriously about the brevity of life, the fated limitations upon the true value of riches, honors, fame. We Americans have a vague feeling that it isn't quite decent to discuss such matters. The Sunday sermon is supposed to look after the distinction between true values and false, between the eternal and the evanescent. Let not the working days look beyond their proper horizon. And so, if we must moralize, we save our faces as best we may by speaking through the mouths of rustics or quaint old negroes, or hide our naked seriousness in a thicket of slang. It is a consequence of the Puritan tradition, to which Louis Untermeyer, for all his brave efforts, remains enchained.

ALVIN JOHNSON.

Women's Wages

Women's Wages, by Emilie Josephine Hutchinson. Columbia University Studies. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

WHEN sex generalities begin to fly, women are referred to as though they were descended from an infinite line of virgin births, and men as though they had propagated by fission, one man from the other, back to an Eveless Adam. To those who feel conscious of an equal number of paternal and maternal ancestors, the fierce division of the sexes is both ridiculous and annoying but to a certain extent they are forced to recognize it. To treat women as a special group of workers may be an artificial distinction but not to admit that this distinction exists is as foolish as denying the strength of the equally artificial barriers of class. Neither can be destroyed without being recognized at least long enough to be examined, and it is this kind of service that is done by a book like Miss Hutchinson's Women's Wages, a study of the wages of industrial women in the United States, and a unique and much needed piece of work.

It is, necessarily, a pre-war study. The detailed government statistics on which she bases her conclusions are those of the 1900-1913 period. No trustworthy information can as yet be had on the influence which the war period may have on women's wages, but whatever we have points only to sporadic and impermanent increases. The more or less mythical women who had been earning twenty to thirty dollars in munition factories had to come back and stand in line for eight-dollar jobs, and lucky to get that, as triumphant employers expressed it. The wage situation before the war, then, is Miss Hutchinson's chief concern, and, after pitiless statistics, she sums it up as follows: "The wages of industrial women are compressed within a narrow range of from four to eight dollars. Occasionally a woman earns over ten dollars. More frequently she earns less than four. She who may be regarded as the typical worker receives five, six or seven dollars in a normal working week."

The only way of looking at these wages is of course through the glasses of the cost of living and the result is disheartening shrinkage. Miss Hutchinson quotes the working-woman's budgets made up by several minimum wage boards. One of them, in 1916, set a minimum wage of $8.98, paring down laundry to 25 cents a week and board and lodging to $5.75, but in a large industry of that state nearly nine-tenths of the workers received less than eight dollars a week.

Here enters of course the picture, so comforting to the employer, of the girl who "lives at home," spending her earnings in powder and chewing gum and depending on a steadily employed father for the rest of life's necessaries.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Miss Hutchinson makes short but convincing work of her. "At least three-fourths of wage-earning girls contribute all of their earnings to the family purse. Over twenty per cent more give part of their earnings. Not more than three per cent retain all of their earnings for themselves." If the mother's labor is considered "in the light of its economic value" and if a woman's share in the light, heat, rent and furniture is considered, there is little difference in the cost of living in lodgings or at home. The only possible advantage for the girl who earns less than a living wage is to be in a family where some one else earns enough of a surplus to make up for her deficiency. And such cases are rare, quite aside from the fact that "parents should not be called upon to subsidize an industry that does not pay a living wage."

Miss Hutchinson, however, is too reasonable a human being to leave the employer entirely naked of any reasons for underpaying women. She marshalls the well known facts of the woman worker's youth, her brief stay in industry and her lack of skill. For the last she recommends vocational education; for the other two she sees the help of minimum wage legislation and stronger trade-union organization. Her faith in the minimum wage, which stretches to an exhaustive, almost exhausting, discussion of it, might be disputed by the trade-unionist, had she not made it clear that she considers organization fully as important as legislation; and that legislation, in fact, should be only for minors of both sexes who because of their youth are difficult to organize. It would then especially benefit girls who to the handicap of their youth have added the handicap of "exaggerated expectations concerning marriage." Many of them never marry, many have to go back to work after marriage, many become widows, but few seventeen-year olds ever consider these sad facts long enough to unionize or to learn a trade.

For these innocents, who are bound to be with us a while longer, minimum wage laws are indubitably needed. The more adult or more disillusioned are beginning to be able to take care of themselves. The National Women's Trade Union League, given due credit by Miss Hutchinson, is the instrument of their will, and a very necessary one. It is not because of any bitter sex exclusiveness that women workers have formed this League. Not only employers deny women the right to a living wage. In Cleveland, recently, one hundred and fifty women street car conductors were refused admittance to the union on the fascinating ground that it would thereby "extend to the women protection against dismissal." After the signing of the armistice the men went on strike to get the women dismissed. "The women were all self-supporting, two-thirds supporting also children and parents . . . . They were employed at the same wages as men." And still the National War Labor Board supported the men.

Miss Hutchinson's valuable book shows clearly that women are forced to unite as a special class of workers until labor realizes that "solidarity" must cross sex as well as craft lines. The minimum wage is patch work, after all, though a necessary patch. Vocational education is more important, if, in the words of a witness before the Commission, "you can forget in education for a while that this is a female and this a male. Do not everlastingly let us put a girl off in a corner making bows when she might make a much better carpenter than the boy. And if a boy can sew on a button better than a girl, why let him sew on his buttons."

This is also the pith of the problem of Women's Wages. One wishes Miss Hutchinson could have written it in equally simple words instead of in a style that has only instructiveness to its credit, but she has at any rate done the important job of adding facts to a field that needs them.

SIGNE TOKSVIG.

Winged Victory

"Créer," by Edouard Herriot, mayor of Lyons, senator of the Rhone: Paris: Payot & Co.

La victoire elle-même n'est pas un point dans le temps. Sur l'Acropole d'Athènes, à droite des Propylées, les Hellènes dédierènt jadis un temple à Nikê Apteros, c'est-à-dire à la Victoire sans ailes; en la mutilant ainsi, ils pensèrent fixer parmi eux pour toujours la jeune déessse qui fait bondir le coeur des hommes. Lorsque le marin, qui venait de doubler Sunium, voyait étinceler dans la lumière lointaine la lance ou l'aigrette d'Athena Promachos; lorsque le passant contemplait le geste immuable de son bras droit armé du javelot, ils croyaient, l'un et l'autre, à l'éternité de leur triomphe. Ils connurent un jour qu'on n'enchaîne pas la Victoire en lui coupant les ailes. Pour les peuples, aujourd'hui . . . il n'est de triomphe durable que la succès sans cesse recrée par l'effort."

Friends of France have had their friendship sadly strained during the year which has passed since the armistice. At times it has seemed as if a perverse demon had taken charge of her affairs since la victoire intégrale, and as if the unclean spirits of all the discredited political manipulators since le Roi-Soleil had entered into and possessed the pleasant land of France. It is the accepted theory now that France has spoiled the League of Nations; her importunities have led to the amazing Triple Alliance with Great Britain and—if the Senate wills—ourselves; she supported the Rumanian intervention in Hungary, and if not actually the friend her policy was certainly not the foe of the Archduke Joseph in his coup to restore the Hapsburgs. She has quarreled—successfully—with Great Britain over Syria; she has quarreled—not quite so successfully—with Italy over what is to be done with the dismembered portions of the old Austro-Hungarian Empire. If she should quarrel with us there will always be some thousands amongst us ready to pay with compound interest "the debt of Lafayette." But there are millions of us who have loved and admired France and who wish to continue to love and admire her without perpetually having to apologize for her national and international politics.

Edouard Herriot's Créer might have been written especially for us, although it is dedicated "aux jeunes gens de France, pour qu'ils soient plus intelligent et plus hardis que nous." It is an extraordinary effort to strike a trial-balance of the total resources of France and her colonies—resources moral as well as physical. It advocates a total transformation of national policy through science. Its doctrine is "produce or perish." And in the light of a sweeping survey, item by item, point by point, it indicates what is to be the future of France. Chapter by chapter the facts are marshalled: her depopulation, her criminal neglect of the most elementary means to combat the declining birth-rate, the rising death-rate, tuberculosis, and alcoholism; her great mineral resources, especially coal, aluminum, and fertilizer phosphates; her lack of iron ore; her immense and undeveloped water-power; her undeveloped railways and waterways; her awful neglect of the means of transporting thought, so that she holds the lowest place among

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

civilized nations in her use of the post, telegraph, and telephone; her inadequate ports; her enormously hopeful agricultural prospects; her small merchant marine; her fisheries; her need of industrialization, and especially of scientific management; how she must build her commercial and financial organizations to meet future needs; the work of her liberal professions; political reform; the renaissance of art; and the creative role of France abroad. That such a book as this could have been written in France to-day is a sign of great promise: that a French statesman could have written it is a covenant with the future.

Edouard Herriot is no newcomer in letters or politics. A recent work of his, Agir, is first in the series of which Créer is second and Vouloir—not yet written—is to be the third. As an author he is already distinguished, as an educator he is famous—he has been a professor at the University of Lyons—and as a political leader his success is evidenced by the fact that he is Mayor of Lyons and Senator for the Department of the Rhone.

An outstanding feature of the book is the author's attitude toward Germany and the Germans. He strenuously combats the current chauvinism which because it hates the Germans refuses to learn from them. France must go to school to Germany as well as to the other great nations, he maintains, but not simply in order to imitate her; she must learn to surpass her. This she can do only by an act of will. As the author says in a brilliant passage:

"Ces politiques d'abstraction ont fait faillite. Il n'y a ni fixité ni simplicité dans l'idée de *nation;* une cinquantaine de peuples au moins ont pris part à la formation de la France; sans cesse une nation se fait et se défait. L'idée de *race* n'a pas plus de valeur; ce n'est même qu'un mot, à peine applicable aux animaux et aux plantes, et qui doit être employé, s'il s'agit de l'homme, avec d'infinies précautions. C'est dire que la fatalité historique est une erreur. Sur la vie de la nation ou de la race, la volonté doit intervenir comme elle agit pour former des variétés, des espèces végétales."

With such a spirit stirring in the France of to-day, we friends of France may well take heart. The struggle will be long and the victory always in doubt, but this book furnishes not only the material on which our faith can work, it helps to recreate the faith itself—that faith without which the dream of the scientist and the labor of the statesman is vain.

EDWARD EYRE HUNT.

A Servant of Reality, by Phyllis Bottome. New York: The Century Co.

OF course one wouldn't mention it for worlds, yet somehow or another suspicion will creep in that Phyllis Bottome has composed her latest novel with the aid of a card index system. After reading A Servant of Reality, one can visualize her method clearly enough. First came the choice of a theme; that of the returned soldier seemed very timely. Shuffling a collection of yellow cards marked Background, she decided on the landed English gentry. And now for complications. She turns to the lavender slips containing the various kinds of love interest and draws forth a card bearing the following inscription:

> KITTY: blonde, clever, has had several lovers. Not respectable, but sympathetic.

She stops a while to meditate. Such a person could really not exist in the respectable milieu she has chosen. Any intrusion of the sort would provoke a problem novel, something any publisher advises you to avoid. So Kitty's death warrant is signed; the cards are shuffled again and cancer is appointed her executioner.

Once the plot has been decided on, Miss Bottome sets about the business of writing. Here she is hard to surpass. The puppets of her fancy she treats with sympathy and with a feminine intuition lacking in most women novelists. Her insight into the emotions of a man lately released from prison camp is almost incredible; time after time she contrives to hide with brilliant workmanship the essential weakness of her story. The result reminds one somewhat of the jerry-built villas that the war has produced in great quantities near London. They stare at one cockily, displaying more than a little jaunty charm, but they are all façade. They don't wear.

The Heart's Domain, by Georges Duhamel. New York: The Century Co.

AN Epicurean cult of the soul which embodied a social consciousness and a moderate optimism was part of the paraphernalia Duhamel carried to war. It survived the terrific test and is restated with a little more emphasis on Epicureanism than before in the limpid prose of The Heart's Domain. Nevertheless the years of slaughter and the sterilizing approach of middle age have overstrained and weakened him. The saving bitterness and hatred and passionate denunciation of Civilization have been purged from his latest work. Instead we read such statements as: "There is only one single thing in the world that is, perhaps, really hateful, stupidity. But even that is disputable, and moreover it is always a presumptuous assertion." And relative to certain greedy rich: "Do not be alarmed, mistaken brothers, do not tremble; we shall not throw down your walls. Live in peace in your sumptuous prison, our portion remains so beautiful and so great that we shall never exhaust it." And concerning the present hour: "But when you no longer contain for us anything but anger and hatred, greed and cruelty, then indeed we must each of us abandon you and turn to our refugees; we must each of us withdraw into the Thebaid where all things still respond to our voice, to our voice alone." These and similar passages focus a Duhamel in transition from insurgency to acquiescence, a Duhamel who denounces an age of machines much as the early factory workers of England expended their wrath on the machinery which threw them out of work without seeing the ultimate motivating forces, a Duhamel who is seeking "an exile that is noble and pure." He has condemned the ivory tower: yet is he not fleeing towards something analogous?

Contributors

HERBERT SIDEBOTHAM, was the military critic of the Manchester Guardian and the editor of the Manchester Guardian's History of the War.

ERNST FREUND is professor of Jurisprudence and Public Law at the University of Chicago.

WILLIAM C. BAGLEY, a former director of the School of Education at the University of Chicago, in 1917 accepted a chair at Teachers' College, Columbia University. He is the author of The Educative Process, Classroom Management, and the co-author with Charles A. Beard of a History of the American People.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New
REPUBLIC
Special Section
VOL. XXI. No. 263

Education: The National Problem

By WILLIAM C. BAGLEY

I

"WHAT do you intend to make of yourself ultimately?"

The question was asked me a few months ago by a new acquaintance to whom I had confided the fact that "my line" was teaching. It was asked in all seriousness, and with no apparent intention to offend, although the questioner could readily see that I was well along in middle life. His "line" was business, and he conceded the fact of his success. He was, as we say, well educated—a graduate of an old and famous college. He was interested in education; in fact he asked me about some plans that he had made to improve the public schools of his own community. And yet all unconsciously, by an innocent question, he revealed and typified the greatest handicap which confronts educational progress in this powerful and prosperous democracy of ours. He wished to advance the cause of public education—but he had an apparently instinctive disrespect for teaching as a calling. To him a man who sought anything akin to a career in the work of the classroom was the victim of a pitiable delusion.

A defense of the profession of teaching is not the purpose of this paper. A defense is not necessary. As an abstract proposition, the statement that teaching is a most important type of public service is never seriously questioned. It is, indeed, eloquently affirmed—often by men who would not for a moment encourage their sons to enter the service. These fine phrases, at their best, mean only an abstract recognition of education as a social necessity; at their worst, they are the emptiest of platitudes—operating because of their obvious insincerity to the prejudice of the teaching service in the eyes of ambitious youth.

And most unfortunately for the welfare of the Nation, the service is becoming progressively less attractive. The time was when teaching, while not highly honored as a permanent calling, was at least looked upon as a thoroughly respectable and even desirable temporary occupation for capable young men who needed to earn a little money toward preparation for a real profession. To teach for a term or two in a district school, or for a year or two in an academy, was considered to be a quite commendable means of turning an honest penny. And when after the Civil War (and partly as a result of the war) the lower schools were given over very largely to the women, teaching became the one conventionally approved remunerative occupation in which a girl could await matrimony.

That teaching is at best only a transitory calling for either men or women has become, then, a fixed tradition. Social and economic forces have been favorable to its cumulative growth. The supply of these temporary teachers until recently has overtopped the demand, hence wages could be kept low. The girls usually lived with their parents, and their earnings were often more in the nature of pin-money than of a living and saving wage. Public education, indeed, has been far from burdensome to the taxpayer. The entire schooling of the average adult native-born citizen has cost the public less than one hundred and fifty dollars—an amount comparable perhaps with that which the village grocer invests in his daughter's piano lessons.

Nor is a low wage scale the only sorry result of the tradition that teaching is not a serious business. Standards of preparation have been kept low. In general, the requirements for a teacher's license in any community have been those that the average girl graduating from the local school could easily meet. To advance requirements beyond this point would mean that the local girls must go elsewhere for preparation, and this would automatically place appointments in the local schools beyond the reach of the larger part of the otherwise available "home talent." The typical public-school teacher comes from a family of four or five children, and from a family that "enjoys" a very moderate income. A study made in 1911 estimated the earnings of the average family from which elementary teachers are drawn at $800 a year. Any attempt to raise standards for the teacher's license to the point where adequate preparation would be required is met at once by "pressure" from the numerous group of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

families that have come to look upon teaching appointments in the local schools as the vested right of their daughters.

Under these conditions, too, it is not surprising that the material rewards of public-school service, meagre as they are, have acquired the earmarks of a public gratuity doled out to the deserving poor,—a point of view that finds tragic expression in the rulings of most boards of education that a woman teacher's tenure ends automatically with her marriage,—unless, as some boards have charitably decreed, her husband is unable to support her!

II

It is small wonder, then, that public-school service has become progressively less and less attractive to the type of young manhood and young womanhood that the Nation needs for this important work. Recent developments have intensified the situation, and have created throughout the country a real crisis. In the early days, conditions were at least tolerable. Teaching was a stop-gap occupation, it is true, but many of the strongest and most promising young men were drawn into the schools for a brief period, and some of these, finding the work to their liking, remained even in the face of meagre rewards and inadequate recognitions. The girls, too, who entered the schools temporarily were usually of a fine type, coming from homes that represented the best ideals and traditions of American life.

Today all this is changed. Almost no men become classroom teachers in the urban elementary schools; they are rapidly deserting the rural schools; and those seeking even temporary appointments in the high schools are diminishing in number and apparently deteriorating in quality. Industrial and commercial enterprise has been quick to see that it pays to catch ability while it is young and to pay generously for its training. Indeed, it is intelligent enough to recognize ability in those no longer young. A man who had served for thirteen years as a teacher, advancing in that time from the district schools to a high-school principalship, recently enrolled at a university to prepare for additional responsibilities in public-school work. Needing funds to meet the increased cost of living, he applied for part-time work in a metropolitan bank. A week later he withdrew from the university giving as a reason the fact that his work at the bank would be full-time. I asked him what he knew about banking. "Absolutely nothing," he replied. "I am learning. The bank will pay me while it is training me more than I have ever received as a teacher. The future possibilities are vastly more attractive than anything that public education can promise. To advance in the educational field I must prepare further at my own expense.—And," he added, "I have a family."

This competition for ability, at first limited to young men, is rapidly extending to young women. In the cities, the gap between graduation and marriage may now be bridged much more rapidly, much more easily, and much more pleasantly through any one of a score of other occupations. Even the girls in the towns and villages who, a few years ago, would have sought appointments in the neighboring rural schools now find more lucrative and attractive opportunities in business and industry. In practically every state there is today an acute shortage of teachers for the rural schools; it has been reported from the headquarters of the National Education Association that nearly a million of children are out of school because teachers cannot be found for them; and this in spite of the fact that wages have been advanced while the standards of certification have been lowered by the wholesale issuing of "emergency" licenses. At least sixty thousand teachers are reported as unable to meet the very meagre standards of the lowest grade of teachers' certificate.

The war, of course, is responsible for the desperateness of the present situation, but the social and economic conditions which have been aggravated by the war were already in evidence long before the war began and sooner or later would have produced the same results. For a decade, according to the testimony of those in closest touch with the situation, the type of recruit drawn into the public-school service has been steadily deteriorating. One normal-school principal, for example, reports that the students now entering his school represent in their scholastic ability the lowest tenth of the high-school graduates of his district; his school formerly attracted students of a superior quality. An investigation in a typical mid-western state reveals the fact that, in personality and often in scholarship, the high-school graduates entering the normal schools to prepare for teaching are distinctly inferior to graduates destined for other occupations. In the eastern states, particularly, the students in the city training schools for teachers represent in ever-increasing proportions the more recently arrived contingents of the immigrant population,—potentially worthy material, no doubt, but necessarily lacking in American traditions and ideals, and sometimes reflecting manners and standards that certainly should not be engrafted upon the next generation of American citizens.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III

Even if the quality of the teaching population did not reveal these symptoms of deterioration, the facts regarding the youth, inexperience, and inadequate training of public-school teachers as a group should, in all conscience, be disquieting. The military draft gave us for the first time an adequate picture of our educational limitations, and its revelations may stimulate us to look upon education as a National problem. Illiteracy suddenly revealed itself as a National handicap when we found, that the two hundred thousand illiterates drawn into the training camps appreciably delayed our military preparations. The pitiable inefficiency of a school system in which one-fourth of all the teachers are scarcely more than boys and girls themselves finds an ominous parallel in the fact that one-fourth of the drafted men were reported as being unable to write an intelligible letter or read a newspaper intelligently.

It is only when we view education as a National problem that the significance of the rural and village schools can be seen in a true perspective. It is the weaknesses of these schools that are primarily responsible for the conditions revealed by the draft. Three hundred thousand teachers are employed in the rural and village service. Taken in the aggregate theirs is at once the most difficult and the most responsible task that public education imposes. Nearly sixty per cent of the next generation of American citizens will have all of their schooling under the direction of these teachers. Most of the schools are of the one-room variety. The teachers are isolated; they lack the help and inspiration that the companionship of fellow-workers alone can furnish. They teach a varied program. They must adjust their teaching to every level of ability represented by from twenty to sixty boys and girls, ranging in age from five or six to fifteen or sixteen. They are unsupervised, except for an occasional call from a county superintendent,—whose office is usually in politics and whose educational qualifications are sometimes as meagre as are those of the teachers whom he is employed to help.

It is thoroughly in keeping with the public attitude toward the work of teaching that the difficult and responsible work of the rural and village schools is given over to the youngest, the most transient, and the least well-trained section of the teaching population. An overwhelming majority of these three hundred thousand teachers have not passed the age of twenty-one; at least one hundred thousand of them are sixteen, seventeen, or eighteen years of age. These estimates are based upon pre-war figures. The condition today is doubtless much worse. A few weeks ago an instructor in a county institute took an age-census of the one hundred and fifty teachers in attendance. Only seven of these teachers had passed their majority. A bulletin just issued by the United States Bureau of Education states that one half of the rural school teachers in a typical middle-western state are twenty years old *or younger*.

These three hundred thousand rural and village teachers as a group have had for their responsible duties no training that deserves the name. Some are products of neighboring high schools and in several states an effort is made to give in the high schools a little instruction that will make the work of a beginner somewhat less bungling; but in no state has this been looked upon as anything more than a temporary and most unsatisfactory expedient,—and the majority of rural-school teachers lack even this. A large proportion of them have not completed a high-school course. Indeed, it is a conservative estimate that no fewer than a million children now enrolled in the rural schools are under teachers who have had no more than eighth-grade education themselves—and many even less.

The rural-school teachers are transient in the calling. The Federal Commissioner of Education estimated that 130,000 recruits were needed for this service last year—an annual "turn-over" of more than one in three. In the state just referred to, the Bureau of Education reports the average term of service of the rural-school teacher to be not more than two years.

In view of these facts, there should be small wonder that native-born illiterates are proportionately six times as numerous in the rural districts as in the urban districts. And when one analyzes the situation it is not surprising that illiteracy is proportionately three times more prevalent among the native-born adults of native-born parentage than among the native-born adults of immigrant parentage—for the immigrant population has tended to congregate in the cities where school terms are relatively long, where the teachers are older, better trained, and less transient than are the rural teachers, and where, especially, the compulsory-attendance laws are generally enforced.

The rural-school problem is not limited to the South, as many people apparently believe. It is an acute problem in every section and in every state. It will remain an acute problem for the Nation until its solution is worked out upon a Nation-wide basis. In very few states can the compulsory-attendance laws be enforced outside of the towns and cities. A truancy officer in one of our richest and most densely populated northern states told me not long ago that it was impossible to enforce the attendance law in the rural districts of her county, and she added that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

she did not know whether it would do any good to enforce it, so poor are the schools and so ill-prepared the teachers.

One thing, at least, is clear: the problems of illiteracy and limited literacy are not to be permanently solved merely by making special provisions for the training of adults whose education has been defective or entirely lacking. Such provisions are necessary to alleviate a serious situation, but the only permanent cure for these evils lies in the wholesale and Nation-wide reform of the rural and village schools. And the reform must center upon the necessity of providing for these schools a relatively permanent and stable body of teachers, thoroughly trained to undertake the responsible duties which these isolated posts impose. Into these schools should go the best talent that the calling can attract. Obviously, the only way to attain this end is to advance the rewards and raise the standards of the rural-school service. The situation could be entirely transformed in a few years and at a paltry cost,—a cost paltry in comparison with what the country would gain. Three hundred thousand well-selected, well-trained and permanent teachers in the rural and village schools could undoubtedly as a group do vastly more for the Nation than an equal number of men and women, as well selected and as well trained, could do in any other form of public or social service, for they could profoundly influence our National life for the greatest good at the very root and source of whatever elements of strength it may possess.

IV.

The situation in the rural and village schools throws its dark shadow over every type of educational work. Urban schools are, in many ways, vastly better off, and yet the fact that the rural and village teachers constituting nearly one half of the teaching population are immature, transient, and untrained, operates to depress standards throughout the entire field. Most of the larger cities, for example, maintain local training schools for elementary teachers, and could easily require reasonably high standards of preparation. With a few exceptions, they demand but one or two years of professional training after the candidate has completed a high-school course. It is generally agreed that two years of such training represent the minimum that should be tolerated, but even our largest and richest cities are content with this. Indeed, of all of our public school teachers only one in five have met this minimum standard. In England the proportion meeting a comparable standard is four in six, and in many of the countries of continental Europe the proportion is still higher.

Why do we hold this low station in respect to a public business which, theoretically, overtops all others in its significance to the welfare and progress of democratic institutions? Surely the cause is not to be found in our poverty, nor is it to be found in a failure to recognize the importance of public education. Again it lies in the tradition that teaching is not a serious and permanent occupation. All of the states support normal schools—but these schools, together with those supported by cities, by counties, and by private and philanthropic enterprise, fail to graduate more than a small fraction of the recruits needed for the service each year.

These schools that prepare for public-school service indeed reflect all too faithfully the low regard in which that service is held. Generally speaking, their standards are far below what one would expect. Their faculties are notoriously underpaid and overworked. Their appropriations from the public funds are more meagre and often more grudgingly granted than are appropriations for any other type of public education of similar grade. Their courses are far too short for effective work. A man who would essay to cure our bodily ills, or adjust our quarrels, or plan our houses, or fill our teeth, finds it necessary to invest three or four years of his mature life in preparation for his responsibilities. Two years is the maximum that we expect of the women to whom we delegate the training of our children through the determining years between the ages of six and fourteen—and then, so little do we regard our offspring that, with four-fifths of our elementary teachers, we waive even this meagre requirement.

V.

The serious problems which these facts reveal will not be easy to solve—but they are very far from insoluble. Obviously they cannot be solved upon a local basis, or even upon a state basis, for they are primarily National problems. The Federal Government has unfortunately no adequate organization or agency through which its educational needs can be made vocal. The creation of such an agency is of imperative importance. The present educational activities of the Nation are scattered without rhyme or reason, some among the various executive departments, others among boards, bureaus, and commissions each directly responsible to Congress. These agencies are extensive enough to involve annual expenditures approximating one hundred and fifty million dollars. Among the weakest and apparently the least im-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portant of them all is the Federal Bureau of Education in the Department of the Interior. This Bureau is supposed to represent public education in our National councils. It has, however, no prestige in Congress; of the educational appropriations made from the Federal Treasury, it administers less than one-third of one per cent; it can exercise little leadership beyond that which attaches to the personality of its Commissioner; its activities, useful and effective within their narrow range, are forced to worry along under the most beggarly support from Congress. There is, of course, a grim consistency in its status: the only division of the Government that represents public-school service at all reflects the conditions of that service with tragic fidelity.

The war has shown clearly that the Nation *as a nation* has distinct and fundamental educational needs and that these needs should have an adequate channel of expression; the service of the public schools has long needed National recognition and the stimulus and inspiration which this implies; both of these ends can be best served by restoring the Bureau of Education to its original status as an executive department—thus recognizing that the care and culture of the Nation's children is as legitimate a matter of National concern as is, for example, the care of the Nation's hogs. It has been contended that the Nation has a special interest in hogs because infected or infested pork may be transported across state boundaries. The argument carries conviction. "Interstate health" is properly a matter of concern to a Government that is obligated to "promote the general welfare" of its component parts. But what about "interstate intelligence"? Children that are permitted to grow up unschooled or poorly schooled can carry and do carry across state boundaries disease germs and parasites that are vastly more dangerous to the health and strength of the body-politic than is the Trichina spiralis. Certainly ignorance, illiteracy, and superstition in any single group of the population imperil the welfare and impede the progress of the Nation as a whole.

It fact, every argument that served to justify the creation of a Department of Agriculture, a Department of Commerce, or a Department of Labor will serve with equal or greater force to justify a Department of Education.

There is no question here of Federal domination or control of local education. That would not only be most undesirable; it would be entirely impossible without a constitutional amendment. A Secretary of Education could no more control the local schools than the Secretary of Agriculture can control the local farms or the Secretary of Labor the local factories. But a Secretary of Education would have the same large opportunity to influence and improve education through leadership, that the Secretary of Agriculture has through leadership to improve farming, or the Secretary of Labor, through leadership rather than through law, to influence and improve the conditions of industrial employment.

VI.

In addition to the creation of a Department of Education, the Federal Government may well extend in a large and generous fashion its established and tested policies of National grants in support of public education. These policies antedate the Constitution; they have been repeatedly reaffirmed and progressively refined during the period of our National life. They began in 1785 with setting aside for the support of public schools one square mile of land in every township of every state carved from the National domain. They continued with increased grants of land for public schools and for state universities; with the distribution of surplus Federal revenues, the allotments of which most of the states added to their permanent public-school funds; with the famous "Morrill" land grants which established the state colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts—the most generous endowment ever made by a government in the interests of higher education; with the later annual "continuing" grants of money to these colleges; with the Hatch act establishing the agricultural experiment stations; with the Nelson and the Smith-Lever acts, both of which carried "continuing" money appropriations to the states; and latest of all with the Smith-Hughes act through which the Federal Government seeks to cooperate with the states in solving the difficult problem of vocational education for boys and girls of high-school age.

This policy of Federal stimulation, encouragement, and cooperation has, in a very real sense, made possible much of what is worthy and efficient in our states systems of public education. It has achieved lasting results for the Nation without imposing Federal domination upon the states. Nor has it "pauperized" the states or the local communities; on the contrary it has greatly augmented local efforts, stimulated state and local initiative, and increased state and local responsibility; the agricultural colleges, originally established and still subsidized by National bounty, derive their revenues in ever-increasing measure from increasingly generous state appropriations. Finally, as a policy of the Government, *it has remained for one hundred thirty-four years undisturbed by a single adverse court decision.*

Congress, then, has indubitably established its

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

right to "promote the general welfare" by encouraging education in the several states. It has established its right to do this both through land grants and through annual "continuing" money grants. In its recent legislation, it has still further stabilized its policy by conditioning each subsidy upon the willingness of the cooperating state to contribute a like amount for the same purpose.

With these rights clearly established, Congress has within its own hands a simple and effective instrument for transforming the public schools into a great educational system worthy of the democracy which has recently saved the world and which now bears upon it a large share of the responsibility for insuring that the world's salvation shall be permanent and abiding. This transformation involves fundamentally the reform of public education at the two points which now constitute, from the Nation's standpoint, both the weakest and the most important links in the chain: (1) the rural and village schools, and (2) the agencies for the preparation of teachers. In addition to these fundamental needs, the revelations of the war justify and demand National attention to (3) the reduction of adult illiteracy, (4) the effective "Americanization" of the immigrant population, and (5) far more comprehensive and pervasive provisions for health education and physical training.

A liberal extension of the traditional and tested policy of "grants in aid" would meet these needs and quickly correct the serious weaknesses in our National life that they reveal. The history of education teaches clearly that nothing less comprehensive than National aid can correct them on a Nation-wide basis. Nor will superficial and temporizing measures bring the desired results. Illiteracy must be attacked not only at the branch, but at the root—and this means a thoroughgoing transformation of rural education. The Americanization of young Americans is certainly no less important than the Americanization of adult immigrants—and both ends can be attained only by earnest, devoted, and well-prepared teachers. Merely to subsidize the education of adult illiterates and adult immigrants is distinctly to temporize with the problem. Only a measure that looks toward the uplifting of the great, inchoate elementary and rural-school systems can achieve permanent and stable results.

VII.

There are before Congress at the present time several bills that look to the solution of one or another of these problems. There is one bill, and only one, that covers them all in a comprehensive fashion. This is the Smith-Towner bill, prepared originally by the Emergency Commission of the National Education Association,—a group of men and women who have had no partisan or selfish interests to serve, and whose only concern has been the welfare of the Nation and the Nation's children.

The bill provides for the creation of a Department of Education. It provides for annual "continuing" grants from the Nation to the states in the following amounts and for the purposes named:

$7,500,000 for the reduction of adult illiteracy in the native-born population;

$7,500,000 for the Americanization of immigrants;

$50,000,000 for "equalizing educational opportunities" particularly through the improvement of the rural schools;

$20,000,000 for health education and physical training;

$15,000,000 for the preparation of teachers.

It provides further that each state accepting any of these grants shall match, dollar for dollar, the Federal allotment for the purpose in question. It explicitly safeguards the autonomy of the states by providing that nothing in the proposed law shall be construed to mean or to justify the imposition upon the states of uniform courses of study, uniform textbooks, or other uniform "plans, means, or methods." It sets up no oppressive machinery of inspection; the proposed contracts between state and Nation presuppose good faith upon both sides,—an assumption that the results of the "grants in aid" now in operation abundantly confirm and justify.

This is the only educational bill now before Congress that has the indorsement of the organized teachers of the Nation, the organized women of the Nation, and the organized labor of the Nation. These organizations represent the people who know most about the evils that the bill seeks to remedy, the people who are best qualified to frame programs for the correction of these evils, and the people who have the most at stake if the evils remain uncorrected.

The Nation is able to solve its fundamental educational problems. It has developed a sound policy that has already justified itself in its results. It has before its representatives in Congress ready to be enacted into law, a comprehensive program, framed consistently with this policy. It has abundwealth and a form of taxation that draws upon that wealth equitably and justly. Has it the wish and the will to place its people's schools on the plane of efficient service that the responsibilities and needs of the Nation plainly and clearly demand?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED